

**In the United States District Court
For the Western District of Texas
San Antonio Division**

Neil Gilmour, Trustee for the Grantor Trusts of §
Victory Medical Center Craig Ranch, LP, §
Victory Medical Center Landmark, LP, §
Victory Medical Center Mid-Cities, LP, § **Civil Action No. 5:17-cv-00518-FB**
Victory Medical Center Plano, LP, §
Victory Medical Center Southcross, LP, §
Victory Parent Company, LLC, §
Victory Medical Center Beaumont, LP, and §
Victory Surgical Hospital East Houston, LP, §
Plaintiffs, §
 §
v. §
 §
Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Alabama; et al., §
Defendants. §

Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint

Plaintiff Neil Gilmour, Trustee for Victory Medical Center Craig Ranch, LP, Victory Medical Center Landmark, LP, Victory Medical Center Mid-Cities, LP, Victory Medical Center Plano, LP, Victory Medical Center Southcross, LP, and Victory Parent Company, LLC; and Plaintiff Victory Medical Beaumont, LP, and Plaintiff Victory Surgical Hospital East Houston LP (collectively, “Plaintiffs”), file this First Amended Complaint against Defendants, Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Alabama; USABLE Mutual Insurance Company (also known as Arkansas Blue Cross and Blue Shield and/or BlueAdvantage Administrators of Arkansas); Anthem Blue Cross Life and Health Insurance Company; California Physicians’ Service; Blue Cross of California; Rocky Mountain Hospital and Medical Service, Inc.; Anthem Health Plans, Inc.; Highmark BCBSO, Inc.; Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Florida, Inc.; Anthem Insurance Companies, Inc.; Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Georgia, Inc.; Blue Cross and Blue Shield Healthcare Plan of Georgia; Blue Cross of Idaho Health Service, Inc.; Blue Cross of

Idaho Care Plus, Inc.; Wellmark, Inc.; Blue Cross Blue Shield of Kansas, Inc.; Anthem Health Plans of Kentucky, Inc.; Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company; BCBS Care First of Maryland; CareFirst of Maryland, Inc.; Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Massachusetts, Inc.; Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan; BCBSM, Inc. d/b/a Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Minnesota; Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Mississippi, a Mutual Insurance Company; RightCHOICE Managed Care, Inc.; Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas City; Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Nebraska; Anthem Health Insurance Company of Nevada; Blue Cross Blue Shield of New Jersey; Horizon Blue Cross and Blue Shield of New Jersey; Empire HealthChoice Assurance, Inc.; Healthnow New York Inc.; Lifetime Healthcare, Inc.; Blue Cross and Blue Shield of North Carolina; Noridian Mutual Insurance Company; Community Insurance Company; Regence BlueCross BlueShield of Oregon; Capital BlueCross; Capital Blue Cross Blue Shield; Capital Hospital Service; Independence Health Group, Inc.; QCC Insurance Company; Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Rhode Island; Blue Cross and Blue Shield of South Carolina; BlueCross BlueShield of Tennessee; Highmark, Inc. d/b/a Blue Cross Blue Shield Highmark; Regence BlueCross BlueShield of Utah; Group Hospitalization and Medical Services, Inc.; Anthem Health Plans of Virginia, Inc.; Regence BlueShield; Premera Blue Cross; Premera Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Alaska; Highmark West Virginia Inc.; and Blue Cross Blue Shield of Wisconsin (collectively, the “BCBS Entities” or “Defendants”):

Jurisdiction and Venue

1. This Court has personal jurisdiction over all Defendants because they all conduct substantial business in Texas and a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to Plaintiffs’ claims occurred in Texas.

2. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 29 U.S.C. §§ 1001 et seq., the Employment Retirement Income Security Act (“ERISA”), as Plaintiffs’ claims in part arise under ERISA. To the extent that Plaintiffs bring claims that do not arise out of ERISA, the Court has supplemental jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1367 or, alternatively, subject matter jurisdiction over those claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a) because this is an action between citizens of different states and the matter in controversy exceeds the sum or value of \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs.

3. Venue is proper in this district pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 1132(e)(2) because at least one or more defendants resides or may be found in this district and because one or more breaches giving rise to his action took place in this district. Specifically, benefits were to be paid to this district, and a substantial number of the BCBS Subscribers at issue in this action reside in this district and thus were to have received relevant benefits in this district but for each associated defendant’s wrongful conduct alleged herein. Additionally, providers are directed by the Defendants to submit claims with the Blue Cross and Blue Shield plan in the state where the services are rendered. All of the disputed services forming the basis of Victory’s causes of action were rendered in Texas, and all the claims for benefits were made to Defendants’ agent in Texas, Blue Cross Blue Shield of Texas (“BCBSTX”). As a result, all or substantially all of the wrongful decisions denying benefits payments were made by BCBSTX in Texas.

Parties

4. Victory Medical Center Craig Ranch, LP (“Victory Craig Ranch”) was a Texas limited partnership that formerly operated a hospital located at 6045 Alma Road, Suites 100 and 200, in McKinney, Collin County, Texas 75070, where Victory Craig Ranch was

headquartered. Victory Craig Ranch was a privately-owned entity that provided specialized-surgical-hospital services to patients in the Dallas-McKinney market. Victory Craig Ranch filed a petition for relief under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code on June 12, 2015, Case Number 15-42379 in the Northern District of Texas, Fort Worth Division.

5. Victory Medical Center Landmark, LP (“Victory Landmark”) was a Texas limited partnership that formerly operated a hospital located at 5330 N. Loop 1604W, in San Antonio, Bexar County, Texas 78249, where Victory Landmark was headquartered. Victory Landmark was a privately-owned entity that provided specialized-surgical-hospital services to patients in the San Antonio market. Victory Landmark filed a petition for relief under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code on June 12, 2015, Case Number 15-42382 in the Northern District of Texas, Fort Worth Division.

6. Victory Medical Center Mid-Cities, LP (“Victory Mid-Cities”) was a Texas limited partnership that formerly operated a hospital located at 1612 Hurst Tower Center Drive, in Hurst, Tarrant County, Texas 76054, where Victory Mid-Cities was headquartered. Victory Mid-Cities was a privately-owned entity that provided specialized-surgical-hospital services to patients in the Dallas-Fort Worth market. Victory Mid-Cities filed a petition for relief under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code on June 12, 2015, Case Number 15-42373 in the Northern District of Texas, Fort Worth Division.

7. Victory Medical Center Plano, LP is (“Victory Plano”) was a Texas limited partnership that formerly operated a hospital located at 2301 Marsh Lane, in Plano, Collin County, Texas 75093, where Victory Plano was headquartered. Victory Plano was a privately-owned entity that provided specialized-surgical-hospital services to patients in the Dallas-Plano market. Victory Plano filed a petition for relief under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code

on June 12, 2015, Case Number 15-42377 in the Northern District of Texas, Fort Worth Division.

8. Victory Medical Center Southcross, LP (“Victory Southcross”), formerly known as Innova Hospital San Antonio, LP, was a Texas limited partnership that formerly operated a hospital located at 4243 E. Southcross Blvd., San Antonio, Texas 78222, where Victory Southcross was headquartered. Victory Southcross was a privately-owned entity that provided specialized-surgical-hospital services to patients in the San Antonio market. Victory Southcross filed a petition for relief under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code on July 10, 2015, Case Number 15-42818 in the Northern District of Texas, Fort Worth Division.

9. Victory Parent Company, LLC (“VPC”) is a Texas limited liability company. VPC as the sole member of Victory Medical Beaumont GP, LLC, the general partner of Victory Beaumont. VPC is also the sole member of Victory Surgical Hospital East Houston GP, LLC, Victory East Houston’s general partner. VPC was headquartered in the city of The Woodlands, Montgomery County, Texas. VPC filed a petition for relief under Chapter 11 of the Bankruptcy Code on June 12, 2015, Case Number 15-12384 in the Northern District of Texas, Fort Worth Division.

10. Plaintiff Neil Gilmour is the trustee for the Grantor Trusts for Victory Medical Center Craig Ranch, LP, Victory Medical Center Landmark, LP, Victory Medical Center Mid-Cities, LP, Victory Medical Center Plano, LP, Victory Medical Center Southcross, LP, and Victory Parent Company, LLC. Gilmour was appointed trustee pursuant to the First Amended Plan of Reorganization (the “Plan”) confirmed on March 28, 2016, in Case No. 15-42373 in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Northern District of Texas, Fort Worth Division.

Pursuant to the Plan, all of the debtors' claims and causes of action against the Defendants have vested in the Grantor Trusts.

11. Plaintiff Victory Medical Center Beaumont, LP ("Victory Beaumont") is a Texas limited partnership that formerly operated a hospital located at 6025 Metropolitan Drive, in Beaumont, Jefferson County, Texas 77706, where Victory Beaumont was headquartered. Victory Beaumont was a privately-owned entity that provided specialized-surgical-hospital services to patients in the Beaumont market.

12. Plaintiff Victory Surgical Hospital East Houston, LP ("Victory East Houston") is a Texas limited partnership that formerly operated a hospital located at 12950 East Freeway, Suite 100, in Houston, Harris County, Texas 77015, where Victory East Houston was headquartered. Victory East Houston was a privately-owned entity that provided specialized-surgical-hospital services to patients in the Houston market.

13. References in this Complaint to "Victory" include collectively, Victory Craig Ranch, Victory Landmark, Victory Mid-Cities, Victory Plano, Victory Southcross, Victory Beaumont, Victory East Houston, and VPC. References in this Complaint to "Plaintiffs" include collectively Victory Beaumont and Victory East Houston, and Neil Gilmour as the Trustee for the Grantor Trusts for Victory Craig Ranch, Victory Landmark, Victory Mid-Cities, Victory Plano, Victory Southcross, and VPC.

14. Defendant Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Alabama ("BCBS-AL") is a corporation of the State of Alabama with its principal place of business located at 450 Riverchase Parkway E., Birmingham, Alabama 35244. It may be served with process through its registered agent, Michael Leonard Patterson, 450 Riverchase Parkway E., Birmingham,

Alabama 35244. BCBS-AL has appeared in this case through its legal counsel **Herman Law Firm** and Jonathan M. Herman.

15. **BCBS-AL** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient R.R., who was treated as an inpatient in this district at Victory Landmark in October 2014 under subscriber number KYI*****¹. Victory submitted a claim to BCBS-AL in the amount of \$312,570.07 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$22,232.90 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against BCBS-AL will be provided to counsel for BCBS-AL in the form attached at **Exhibit 1**².

16. Defendant Arkansas Blue Cross and Blue Shield ("**BCBS-AR**"), also known as USABLE Mutual Insurance Company, is a corporation of the State of Arkansas with its principal place of business located at 601 S. Gaines Street, Little Rock, Arkansas 72201. It may be served with process through its registered agent, Lee Douglass, P.O. Box 2181, Little Rock, Arkansas 72203. BCBS-AR has appeared in this case through its legal counsel **Jones Walker LLP**, Michael C. Drew, Covert J. Geary, and Tyler J. Rench.

17. **BCBS-AR** breached plans in Texas, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient T.P., who was treated as an inpatient at Victory Mid-Cities in June 2014 under subscriber number RJO*****. Victory

¹ The complete subscriber numbers are redacted to protect each patient's protected health information ("PHI") in compliance with HIPAA.

² **Exhibits 1** through **48** are attached in redacted form to withhold each patient's PHI in compliance with HIPAA. Non-redacted copies of the exhibits will be provided to counsel for each Defendant.

submitted a claim to BCBS-AR in the amount of \$60,440.70 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$5,344.66 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against BCBS-AR will be provided to counsel for BCBS-AR in the form attached at **Exhibit 2**.

18. Defendant BlueAdvantage Administrators of Arkansas ("**BAA**"), also known as USABLE Mutual Insurance Company, is a corporation of the State of Arkansas with its principal place of business located at 601 S. Gaines Street, Little Rock, Arkansas 72201. It may be served with process through its registered agent, Lee Douglass, P.O. Box 2181, Little Rock, Arkansas 72203. BAA has appeared in this case through its legal counsel **Jones Walker LLP**, Michael C. Drew, Covert J. Geary, and Tyler J. Rench.

19. **BAA** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient C.A., who was treated as an inpatient in this district at Victory Landmark in October 2013 under subscriber number WMW*****. Victory submitted a claim to BAA in the amount of \$58,090.37 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$1,934.97 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against BAA will be provided to counsel for BAA in the form attached at **Exhibit 3**.

20. Defendant California Physicians' Service, previously identified as Blue Shield of California Life & Health Insurance Company d/b/a Blue Shield of California ("**BCBS-CA**") is a corporation of the State of California with its principal place of business located at 50 Beale Street, San Francisco, California 94105. It may be served with process through its registered agent, Cogency Global Inc., 1325 J Street Suite 1550, Sacramento, California 95814.

BCBS-CA has appeared in this case through its legal counsel, **Jones Walker, LLP**, Covert J. Geary, Michael C. Drew, and Tyler J. Rench.

21. **BCBS-CA** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient S.A., who was treated as an inpatient in this district at Victory Southcross in January 2013 under subscriber number XEC*****. Victory submitted a claim to BCBS-CA in the amount of \$97,962.47 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$888.31 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against BCBS-CA will be provided to counsel for BCBS-CA in the form attached at **Exhibit 4**.

22. Defendant Highmark BCBSD, Inc. d/b/a Highmark Blue Cross Blue Shield Delaware (“**BC-DE**”) is a corporation of the State of Delaware with its principal place of business located at 800 Delaware Ave., Suite 900, Wilmington, Delaware 19801. It may be served with process through its registered agent, President, Timothy J. Constantine, at 800 Delaware Ave., Suite 900, Wilmington, Delaware 19801. BC-DE has appeared in this case through its legal counsel **Jones Walker LLP**, Michael C. Drew, Covert J. Geary, and Tyler J. Rench.

23. **BC-DE** breached plans in Texas, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient T.M., who was treated as an outpatient at Victory Mid-Cities in October 2014 under subscriber number WLZ*****. Victory submitted a claim to BC-DE in the amount of \$14,090.01 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$494.55 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against BC-DE will be provided to counsel for BC-DE in the form attached at **Exhibit 5**.

24. Defendant Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Florida, Inc. d/b/a Florida Blue (“**BCBS-FL**”) is a corporation of the State of Florida with its principal place of business located at 4800 Deerwood Campus Parkway, Jacksonville, Florida 32246. It may be served with process through its registered agent, CFO, Charles Divita, III, at 200 E. Gaines St., Tallahassee, Florida 32399, or 4800 Deerwood Campus Parkway, Jacksonville, Florida 32246. BCBS-FL has appeared in this case through its legal counsel **Jones Walker LLP**, Michael C. Drew, Covert J. Geary, and Tyler J. Rench.

25. **BCBS-FL** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by failing to pay benefits related to patient M.T., who was treated as an outpatient in this district at Victory Landmark in March 2015 under subscriber number LKPH*****. Victory submitted a claim to BCBS-FL in the amount of \$14,400.40 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received zero dollars (\$0) on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against BCBS-FL will be provided to counsel for BCBS-FL in the form attached at **Exhibit 6**.

26. Defendant Wellmark, Inc. d/b/a Wellmark Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Iowa d/b/a Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Iowa (“**BCBSW-IA**”) is a corporation of the State of Iowa with its principal place of business located at 1331 Grand Avenue, Des Moines, Iowa 50309. It may be served with process through its registered agent, CT Corporation System, 400 E. Court Ave., Des Moines, Iowa 50309. BCBSW-IA has appeared in this case through its legal counsel **Jones Walker LLP**, Michael C. Drew, Covert J. Geary, and Tyler J. Rench.

27. **BCBSW-IA** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient C.D., who was treated as an inpatient in this district at Victory Landmark in November 2013 under subscriber

number RUA*****. Victory submitted a claim to BCBSW-IA in the amount of \$251,023.21 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$14,147.75 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against BCBSW-IA will be provided to counsel for BCBSW-IA in the form attached at **Exhibit 7**.

28. Defendant Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company d/b/a Blue Cross Blue Shield of Louisiana (“**BCBS-LA**”) is a corporation of the State of Louisiana with its principal place of business located at 5525 Reitz Avenue, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70809. It may be served with process through its registered agent, Michelle S. Calandro, 5525 Reitz Avenue, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70809. BCBS-LA has appeared in this case through its legal counsel **Jones Walker LLP**, Michael C. Drew, Covert J. Geary, and Tyler J. Rench.

29. **BCBS-LA** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by failing to pay benefits related to patient H.K., who was treated as an inpatient in this district at Victory Southcross in January 2013 under subscriber number XUP*****. Victory submitted a claim to BCBS-LA in the amount of \$622,815.95 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received zero dollars (\$0) on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against BCBS-LA will be provided to counsel for BCBS-LA in the form attached at **Exhibit 8**.

30. Defendant Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Massachusetts, Inc also doing business as Blue Benefit Administrators. (“**BCBS-MA**”) is a corporation of the State of Massachusetts with its principal place of business located at 101 Huntington Ave., # 1300, Boston, Massachusetts 02199. It may be served with process through its registered agent, Donald J. Savery, Attn: Legal Dept., 101 Huntington Ave., # 1300, Boston, Massachusetts

02199. BCBS-MA has appeared in this case through its legal counsel **Jones Walker LLP**, Michael C. Drew, Covert J. Geary, and Tyler J. Rench.

31. **BCBS-MA** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by failing to pay benefits related to patient A.C., who was treated as an inpatient in this district at Victory Southcross in August 2013 under subscriber number FMC*****. Victory submitted a claim to BCBS-MA in the amount of \$99,347.68 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received zero dollars (\$0) on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against BCBS-MA will be provided to counsel for BCBS-MA in the form attached at **Exhibit 9**.

32. Defendant BCBSM, Inc. d/b/a Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Minnesota (“**BCBS-MN**”) is a corporation of the State of Minnesota with its principal place of business located at 3535 Blue Cross Road, Eagan, Minnesota 55122. It may be served with process through its President, Michael J. Guyette, 3535 Blue Cross Rd., Eagan, Minnesota 55122-1154. BCBS-MN has appeared in this case through its legal counsel **Jones Walker LLP**, Michael C. Drew, Covert J. Geary, and Tyler J. Rench.

33. **BCBS-MN** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by failing to pay benefits related to patient J.G., who was treated as an outpatient in this district at Victory Southcross in March 2013 under subscriber number FMC*****. Victory submitted a claim to BCBS-MN in the amount of \$25,252.22 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received zero dollars (\$0) on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims

against BCBS-MN will be provided to counsel for BCBS-MN in the form attached at **Exhibit 10**.

34. Defendant Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Mississippi, a Mutual Insurance Company (“**BCBS-MS**”) is a corporation of the State of Mississippi with its principal place of business located at 3545 Lakeland Dr., Flowood, Mississippi 39232. It may be served with process through its registered agent, Cheri D. Green, 3545 Lakeland Dr., Flowood, Mississippi 39232. BCBS-MS has appeared in this case through its legal counsel **Jones Walker LLP**, Michael C. Drew, Covert J. Geary, and Tyler J. Rench.

35. **BCBS-MS** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient C.M., who was treated as an outpatient in this district at Victory Landmark in April 2014 under subscriber number CAF*****. Victory submitted a claim to BCBS-MS in the amount of \$89,683.14 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$13,815.92 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against BCBS-MS will be provided to counsel for BCBS-MS in the forms attached at **Exhibit 11**.

36. Defendant Horizon Blue Cross and Blue Shield of New Jersey also known as Blue Cross Blue Shield of New Jersey (“**HBCBS-NJ**”) is a corporation of the State of New Jersey with a principal place of business located at Three Penn Plaza East, Newark, New Jersey 07105. **HBCBS-NJ** may be served with process through its registered agent, Thomas J. Calvocoressi, Three Penn Plaza East, Newark, New Jersey 07105. BCBS-NJ and HBCBS-NJ have appeared in this case through their legal counsel **Jones Walker LLP**, Michael C. Drew, Covert J. Geary, and Tyler J. Rench.

37. **HBCBS-NJ** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by significantly underpaying benefits related to patient V.R., who was treated as an inpatient in this district at Victory Landmark in June 2014 under subscriber number KDJ*****. Victory submitted a claim to HBCBS-NJ in the amount of \$86,693.69 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$13,219.76 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against HBCBS-NJ will be provided to counsel for HBCBS-NJ in the form attached at **Exhibit 12**.

38. Defendant Blue Cross and Blue Shield of North Carolina ("**BCBS-NC**") is a corporation of the State of North Carolina with its principal place of business located at 4613 University Drive, Durham, North Carolina 27707. It may be served with process through its registered agent, N. King Prather, at 4613 University Drive, Durham, North Carolina 27707 and PO Box 2291, Durham, North Carolina, 27702-2291. BCBS-NC has appeared in this case through its legal counsel **Jones Walker LLP**, Michael C. Drew, Covert J. Geary, and Tyler J. Rench.

39. **BCBS-NC** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient R.R., who was treated as an outpatient in this district at Victory Southcross in February 2012 under subscriber number MZN*****. Victory submitted a claim to BCBS-NC \$66,571.84 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$6,852.85 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against BCBS-NC will be provided to counsel for BCBS-NC in the form attached at **Exhibit 13**.

40. Defendant Regence BlueCross BlueShield of Oregon (“**RBCBS-OR**”) is a corporation of the State of Oregon with its principal place of business located at 100 S.W. Market St., Portland, Oregon 97201. It may be served with process through its registered agent, Corporation Service Company, 1127 Broadway St., NE, Ste. 310, Salem, Oregon 97301. RBCBS-OR initially appeared in this case through its legal counsel, Munsch Hardt Kopf & Harr, P.C., D. Ronald Reneker, and Tracy L. McCreight but are now represented by **Jones Walker LLP**, Michael C. Drew, Covert J. Geary, and Tyler J. Rench.

41. **RBCBS-OR** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient J.L., who was treated as an outpatient in this district at Victory Landmark in December 2013 under subscriber number RRT*****. Victory submitted a claim to RBCBS-OR in the amount of \$43,953.63 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$2,352.43 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against RBCBS-OR will be provided to counsel for RBCBS-OR in the form attached at **Exhibit 14**.

42. Highmark, Inc. d/b/a Highmark Blue Cross Blue Shield d/b/a Highmark Blue Shield (“**HBCBS-PA**”) is a corporation of the State of Pennsylvania with its principal place of business located at Fifth Avenue Place, 120 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222. It may be served with process through its officers, David Holmberg, Karen Hanlon, Nanette Detruk, or Thomas Vankirk, Fifth Avenue Place, 120 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15122. HBCBS-PA has appeared in this case through its legal counsel **Jones Walker LLP**, Michael C. Drew, Covert J. Geary, and Tyler J. Rench.

43. **HBCBS-PA** breached plans in Texas, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient V.K., who was treated as an outpatient in Texas at Victory Plano in December 2013 under subscriber number SBR*****. Victory submitted a claim to HBCBS-PA in the amount of \$22,558.99 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory only received \$230.60 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against HBCBS-PA will be provided to counsel for HBCBS-PA in the forms attached at **Exhibit 15**.

44. Independence Health Group, Inc., including its subsidiaries Independence Blue Cross, Independence Administrators, and QCC Insurance Company (collectively “**IHGI**”), is a corporation of the State of Pennsylvania with its principal place of business located at 1901 Market Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103. It may be served with process through its officers, Alan Krigstein, Daniel Hilferty, Thomas Hutton, or Yvette Bright, at 1901 Market Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103. Independence Health Group, Inc. has appeared in this case through its legal counsel **Jones Walker LLP**, Michael C. Drew, Covert J. Geary, and Tyler J. Rench.

45. **IHGI** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient D.M., who was treated as an inpatient in this district at Victory Southcross in August 2013 under subscriber number ULB*****. Victory billed IHGI \$244,091.72 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$51,627.24 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against IHGI will be provided to counsel for IHGI in the form attached at **Exhibit 16**.

46. Defendant Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Rhode Island (“**BCBS-RI**”) is a corporation of the State of Rhode Island with its principal place of business located at 500 Exchange St., Providence, Rhode Island 02903. It may be served with process through its registered agent, Michele B. Lederberg, 500 Exchange St., Providence, Rhode Island 02903. BCBS-RI has appeared in this case through its legal counsel **Jones Walker LLP**, Michael C. Drew, Covert J. Geary, and Tyler J. Rench.

47. BCBS-RI breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient M.C., who was treated as an outpatient in this district at Victory Landmark in September 2013 under subscriber number ZBF*****. Victory submitted a claim to BCBS-RI in the amount of \$15,562.08 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$412.93 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against BCBS-RI will be provided to counsel for BCBS-RI in the form attached at **Exhibit 17**.

48. Defendant Blue Cross and Blue Shield of South Carolina (“**BCBS-SC**”) is a corporation of the State of South Carolina with its principal place of business located at 1000 Executive Center Dr., Greenville, South Carolina 29615. It may be served with process through its registered agent, Duncan S. McIntosh, 2501 Faraway Drive, Columbia, South Carolina 292223. BCBS-SC has appeared in this case through its legal counsel **Jones Walker LLP**, Michael C. Drew, Covert J. Geary, and Tyler J. Rench.

49. **BCBS-SC** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient D.L., who was treated as an outpatient in this district at Victory Southcross in December 2012 under subscriber number ZCW*****. Victory submitted a claim to BCBS-SC in the amount

of \$16,028.56 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$1,134.80 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against BCBS-SC will be provided to counsel for BCBS-SC in the form attached at **Exhibit 18**.

50. Defendant Regence BlueCross BlueShield of Utah (“**BCBS-UT**”) is a corporation of the State of Utah with its principal place of business located at 2890 E Cottonwood Parkway, Cottonwood, Utah 84121. It may be served with process through its registered agent, Corporation Service Company, 15 West South Temple, Suite 1701, Salt Lake City, Utah 84101. BCBS-UT initially appeared in this case through its legal counsel, Munsch Hardt Kopf & Harr, P.C., D. Ronald Reneker, and Tracy L. McCreight but is now represented by **Jones Walker LLP**, Michael C. Drew, Covert J. Geary, and Tyler J. Rench.

51. **BCBS-UT** breached plans in Texas, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient D.S., who was treated as an outpatient in Texas at Victory Plano in March 2013 under subscriber number RII*****. Victory submitted a claim to BCBS-UT in the amount of \$16,845.49 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$893.15 on its claim. Details regarding the specific claims against BCBS-UT will be provided to counsel for BCBS-UT in the form attached at **Exhibit 19**.

52. Defendant Regence BlueShield, also doing business as Regence Group Administrators (“**RBCBS-WA**”) is a corporation of the State of Washington with its principal place of business located at 7001 220th St., SW, Bldg. 1, Mountlake Terrace, Washington 98043. It may be served with process through its registered agent, Corporation Service Company, 300 Deschutes Way SW, Suite 304, Tumwater, Washington 98501. RBCBS-WA

has appeared in this case through its legal counsel **Jones Walker LLP**, Michael C. Drew, Covert J. Geary, and Tyler J. Rench

53. **RBCBS-WA** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient J.W., who was treated as an inpatient in this district at Victory Southcross in December 2013 under subscriber number UDW*****. Victory submitted a claim to RBCBS-WA in the amount of \$636,973.61 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$24,206.54 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against RBCBS-WA will be provided to counsel for RBCBS-WA in the form attached at **Exhibit 20**.

54. Defendant Premiera Blue Cross and Premiera Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Alaska ("**BCBS Premiera**") is a corporation of the State of Washington with its principal place of business located at 7001 220th St., SW, Bldg. 1, Mountlake Terrace, Washington 98043. It may be served with process through its registered agent, C T Corporation System, 711 Capitol Way S Ste 204, Olympia, Washington 98501. BCBS Premiera has appeared in this case through its legal counsel **Jones Walker LLP**, Michael C. Drew, Covert J. Geary, and Tyler J. Rench.

55. **BCBS Premiera** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient M.B, who was treated as an inpatient in this district at Victory Landmark in September 2014 under subscriber number AQT*****. Victory submitted a claim to BCBS Premiera in the amount of \$212,105.52 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$8,901.58 on this claim. Details regarding the

specific claims against BCBS Premera will be provided to counsel for BCBS Premera in the forms attached at **Exhibit 21** and **Exhibit 22**.

56. Defendant Highmark West Virginia Inc. (“**Highmark-WV**”) is a corporation of the State of West Virginia with its principal place of business located at 614 Market St., Parkersburg, West Virginia 26101. It may be served with process through its registered agent, James Fawcett, PO Box 1948, Parkersburg, WV 26102. Highmark-WV has appeared in this case through its legal counsel **Jones Walker LLP**, Michael C. Drew, Covert J. Geary, and Tyler J. Rench.

57. **Highmark-WV** breached plans in Texas, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient G.C., who was treated as an inpatient in Texas at Victory Mid-Cities in December 2012 under subscriber number ZPN*****. Victory submitted a claim to Highmark-WV in the amount of \$169,833.42 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$38,541.31 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against Highmark-WV will be provided to counsel for Highmark-WV in the form attached at **Exhibit 23**.

69. Defendant Blue Cross of California d/b/a Anthem Blue Cross (“**ABC-CA**”) is a corporation of the State of California with its principal place of business located at 21555 Oxnard Street, Woodland Hills, California 91367. It may be served with process through its registered agent, Nancy Flores, 818 West 7th St., # 930, Los Angeles, California 90017. Blue Cross of California has appeared in this case through its legal counsel, **Edison McDowell & Hetherington, LLP**, Blaire B. Johnson, Thomas F.A. Hetherington, and Kate H. Easterling.

70. **ABC-CA** breached plans in Texas, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient T.A., who was treated as an inpatient in Texas at Victory Mid-Cities in December 2014 under subscriber number ADA*****. Victory submitted a claim to ABC-CA in the amount of \$148,717.37 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$12,696.61 on its claim. Details regarding the specific claims against ABC-CA will be provided to counsel for ABC-CA in the form attached at **Exhibit 24**.

71. Defendant Anthem Blue Cross Life and Health Insurance Company, also known as Blue Cross Blue Shield of California (“**ABCBS-CA**”) is a corporation of the State of California with its principal place of business located at located at 120 Monument Circle, Indianapolis Indiana 46204. It may be served with process through its registered agent, CT Corporation System, 818 W 7th St Ste 930, Los Angeles, California 90017. ABCBS-CA has appeared in this case through its legal counsel, **Edison McDowell & Hetherington, LLP**, Blaire B. Johnson, Thomas F.A. Hetherington, and Kate H. Easterling.

72. **ABCBS-CA** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient A.B., who was treated as an inpatient in this district at Victory Southcross in December 2012 under subscriber number PAF*****. Victory submitted a claim to ABCBS-CA in the amount of \$64,781.92 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$2,889.27 on its claim. Details regarding the specific claims against ABCBS-CA will be provided to counsel for ABCBS-CA in the form attached at **Exhibit 25**.

73. Defendant Rocky Mountain Hospital and Medical Service, Inc. d/b/a Anthem Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Colorado and also d/b/a Anthem Health Insurance Company of Nevada or Anthem Blue Cross Blue Shield of Nevada (“**RMHMS**”) is a corporation of the State of Colorado with its principal place of business located at 555 Middle Creek Parkway, Colorado Springs, Colorado 80921. It may be served with process through its registered agent, The Corporation Company, 7700 E. Arapahoe Road Suite 220, Centennial, CO 80112-1268. RMHMS has appeared in this case through its legal counsel, **Edison McDowell & Hetherington, LLP**, Blaire B. Johnson, Thomas F.A. Hetherington, and Kate H. Easterling.

74. **RMHMS** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient R.V., who was treated as an inpatient in this district at Victory Landmark in August 2013 under subscriber number NRX*****. Victory submitted a claim to RMHMS in the amount of \$268,294.94 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$10,537.36 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against RMHMS will be provided to counsel for RMHMS in the form attached at **Exhibit 26**.

75. Defendant Anthem Health Plans, Inc. d/b/a Anthem Blue Cross and Blue Shield Connecticut (“**BCBS-CT**”) is a corporation of the State of Connecticut with its principal place of business located at 370 Bassett Rd., North Haven, Connecticut 06473. It may be served with process through its registered agent, CT Corporation System, One Corporate Center, Hartford, Connecticut, 06103-3220. BCBS-CT has appeared in this case through its legal counsel, **Edison McDowell & Hetherington, LLP**, Blaire B. Johnson, Thomas F.A. Hetherington, and Kate H. Easterling.

76. **BCBS-CT** breached plans in Texas, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient V.G., who was treated as an outpatient at Victory Plano in September 2013 under subscriber number XC0*****. Victory billed BCBS-CT \$75,303.66 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory only received \$11,622.55 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against BCBS-CT will be provided to counsel for BCBS-CT in the form attached at **Exhibit 27**.

77. Defendant Anthem Insurance Companies, Inc. also d/b/a Blue Cross Blue Shield of Indiana ("**BCBS-IN**") is a corporation of the State of Indiana with its principal place of business located at 120 Monument Circle, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-4906. It may be served with process through its registered agent, CT Corporation System, 150 West Market Street, Suite 800, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204. BCBS-IN and ABCBS-GA have appeared in this case through their legal counsel, **Edison McDowell & Hetherington, LLP**, Blaire B. Johnson, Thomas F.A. Hetherington, and Kate H. Easterling.

78. **BCBS-IN** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient K.G., who was treated as an inpatient in this district at Victory Southcross in February 2012 under subscriber number KUJ*****. Victory submitted a claim to BCBS-IN in the amount of \$166,377.89 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory only received \$23,131.69 in insurance payments on its claim. Details regarding the specific claims against BCBS-IN will be provided to counsel for BCBS-IN in the form attached at **Exhibit 28**.

79. Defendant Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Georgia, Inc. (“**BCBS-GA**”) is a corporation of the State of Georgia with its principal place of business located at 120 Monument Circle, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204. It may be served with process through its registered agent, CT Corporation System, 289 S Culver St., Gwinnett, Lawrenceville, Georgia, 30046-4805. BCBS-GA has appeared in this case through its legal counsel, **Edison McDowell & Hetherington, LLP**, Blaire B. Johnson, Thomas F.A. Hetherington, and Kate H. Easterling.

80. **BCBS-GA** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient A.S., who was treated as an outpatient in this district at Victory Southcross in April 2013 under subscriber number KKD*****. Victory submitted a claim to BCBS-GA in the amount of \$66,147.80 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$6,509.86 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against BCBS-GA will be provided to counsel for BCBS-GA in the form attached at **Exhibit 29**.

81. Defendant Blue Cross and Blue Shield Healthcare Plan of Georgia (“**BCBSH-GA**”) is a corporation of the State of Georgia with its principal place of business located at 120 Monument Circle, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204. It may be served with process through its registered agent, CT Corporation System, 289 S Culver St., Gwinnett, Lawrenceville, Georgia, 30046-4805. BCBS-GA has appeared in this case through its legal counsel, **Edison McDowell & Hetherington, LLP**, Blaire B. Johnson, Thomas F.A. Hetherington, and Kate H. Easterling.

82. **BCBSH-GA** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient T.S., who was treated as an outpatient in this district at Victory Landmark in May 2014 under subscriber

number SJN*****. Victory submitted a claim to BCBSH-GA in the amount of \$24,457.43 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$2,809.09 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against BCBSH-GA will be provided to counsel for BCBSH-GA in the form attached at **Exhibit 30**.

83. Defendant Anthem Health Plans of Kentucky, Inc. (“**ABCBS-KY**”) is a corporation of the State of Kentucky with its principal place of business located at 13550 Triton Park Blvd., Louisville, Kentucky 40223. It may be served with process through its registered agent, CT Corporation System, 306 W. Main St., Suite 512, Frankfort, Kentucky 40601. ABCBS-KY has appeared in this district through its legal counsel, **Edison McDowell & Hetherington, LLP**, Blaire B. Johnson, Thomas F.A. Hetherington, and Kate H. Easterling.

84. **ABCBS-KY** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient R.A., who was treated as an inpatient in this district at Victory Landmark in September 2013 under subscriber number RUA*****. Victory submitted a claim to ABCBS-KY in the amount of \$401,025.22 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$18,050.62 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against ABCBS-KY will be provided to counsel for ABCBS-KY in the form attached at **Exhibit 31**.

85. Defendant RightCHOICE Managed Care, Inc. d/b/a Anthem Blue Cross and Blue Shield Missouri d/b/a Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Missouri (“**BCBS-MO**”) is a corporation of the State of Delaware with its principal place of business located at 1831 Chestnut Street, St. Louis, Missouri 63103. It may be served with process through its registered

agent, CT Corporation System, 128 South Central Avenue, Clayton, Missouri 63105. **BCBS-MO** has appeared in this case through its legal counsel, **Edison McDowell & Hetherington, LLP**, Blaire B. Johnson, Thomas F.A. Hetherington, and Kate H. Easterling.

86. **BCBS-MO** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient M.M., who was treated as an inpatient in this district at Victory Landmark in October 2013 under subscriber number KRN*****. Victory submitted a claim to BCBS-MO in the amount of \$282,399.87 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$11,477.85 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against BCBS-MO will be provided to counsel for BCBS-MO in the form attached at **Exhibit 32**.

87. Defendant Empire HealthChoice Assurance, Inc. d/b/a Empire Blue Cross Blue Shield and as Blue Cross Blue Shield of New York ("**BCBS Empire Blue**") is a corporation of the State of New York with its principal place of business located at 1 Liberty Plaza, 165 Broadway, New York, New York 10006. It may be served with process through the Superintendent of Insurance, New York State Department of Financial Services, Corporate Affairs Unit, One Commerce Plaza, 20th Floor, Albany, New York 12257. BCBS Empire Blue has appeared in this case through its legal counsel, **Edison McDowell & Hetherington, LLP**, Blaire B. Johnson, Thomas F.A. Hetherington, and Kate H. Easterling.

88. **BCBS Empire Blue** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient K.C., who was treated as an outpatient in this district at Victory Landmark in October 2013 under subscriber number YFW*****. Victory submitted a claim to BCBS Empire Blue in the amount of

\$67,923.79 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$6,425.79 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against BCBS Empire Blue will be provided to counsel for BCBS Empire Blue in the form attached at **Exhibit 33**.

89. Defendant Healthnow New York Inc. d/b/a Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Western New York, Inc. ("**BCBS-WNY**") is a corporation of the State of New York with its principal place of business located at 257 West Genesee Street, Buffalo, New York 14202. It may be served with process through the Secretary of State Rossana Rosado, One Commerce Plaza, 99 Washington Avenue, Albany, NY 12231. BCBS-WNY has appeared in this case through its legal counsel, **Edison McDowell & Hetherington, LLP**, Blaire B. Johnson, Thomas F.A. Hetherington, and Kate H. Easterling.

90. **BCBS-WNY** breached plans in Texas, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient T.O., who was treated as an inpatient in Texas at Victory Mid-Cities in June 2014 under subscriber number BVT*****. Victory submitted a claim to BCBS-WNY in the amount of \$118,384.31 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$17,073.89 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against BCBS-WNY will be provided to counsel for BCBS-WNY in the form attached at **Exhibit 34**.

91. Defendant Community Insurance Company d/b/a Anthem Blue Cross of Ohio and/or Blue Cross Blue Shield of Ohio ("**ABCBS-OH**") is a corporation of the State of Ohio with its principal place of business located at 120 Monument Circle, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204. It may be served with process through its registered agent, CT Corporation System,

4400 Easton Commons Way Suite 125, Columbus, Ohio 43219. **ABCBS-OH** has appeared in this case through its legal counsel **Edison McDowell & Hetherington, LLP**, Blaire B. Johnson, Thomas F.A. Hetherington, and Kate H. Easterling.

92. **ABCBS-OH** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient K.K., who was treated as an inpatient in this district at Victory Southcross in March 2013 under subscriber number YRP*****. Victory submitted a claim to ABCBS-OH in the amount of \$471,775.53 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$10,562.25 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against ABCBS-OH will be provided to counsel for ABCBS-OH in the form attached at **Exhibit 35**.

93. Anthem Health Plans of Virginia, Inc. d/b/a Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Virginia and/or Anthem Blue Cross Blue Shield of Virginia (“**ABCBS-VA**”) is a corporation of the State of Virginia with its principal place of business located at 2015 Staples Mill Road, Richmond, Virginia 23230. It may be served with process through its registered agent, CT Corporation Systems, 4701 Cox Rd. # 285, Glen Allen, Virginia 23060. ABCBS-VA has appeared in this case through its legal counsel, **Edison McDowell & Hetherington, LLP**, Blaire B. Johnson, Thomas F.A. Hetherington, and Kate H. Easterling.

94. **ABCBS-VA** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient J.E., who was treated as an inpatient in this district at Victory Southcross in July 2013 under subscriber number PZV*****. Victory submitted a claim to ABCBS-VA in the amount of \$112,166.83 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered

services. However, Victory received only \$6,095.90 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against ABCBS-VA will be provided to counsel for ABCBS-VA in the form attached at **Exhibit 36**.

95. Defendants Blue Cross of Idaho Care Plus, Inc. and Blue Cross of Idaho Health Service, Inc. d/b/a Blue Cross of Idaho (“**BCBS-ID**”) is a corporation of the State of Idaho with a principal place of business located at 3000 E. Pine Ave., Meridian, Idaho 83642. BCBS-ID may be served with process through its registered agent, Steven J. Tobiason, 3000 E. Pine Ave., Meridian, Idaho 83642. BCBS-ID has appeared in this case through its legal counsel, Gonzalez Chiscano Angulo & Kasson, PC and Henry B. Gonzalez, III and **Foley & Lardner, LLP**, Michael A. Naranjo, and Kimberly A. Klinsport.

96. **BCBS-ID** breached plans in Texas, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient B.Y., who was treated as an outpatient in Texas at Victory Mid-Cities in May 2013 under subscriber number AQE*****. Victory submitted a claim to BCBS-ID in the amount of \$16,943.56 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$795.08 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against BCBS-ID will be provided to counsel for BCBS-ID in the form attached at **Exhibit 37**.

97. Defendant Blue Cross Blue Shield of Kansas, Inc. (“**BCBS-KS**”) is a corporation of the State of Kansas with its principal place of business located at 1133 Topeka Avenue, Topeka, Kansas 66609. It may be served with process through its agent, President/CEO, Andrew Corbin, 1133 Topeka Avenue, Topeka, Kansas 66609. BCBS-KS has appeared in this case through its legal counsel, Gonzalez Chiscano Angulo & Kasson, PC and

Henry B. Gonzalez, III and **Foley & Lardner, LLP**, Michael A. Naranjo, and Kimberly A. Klinsport.

98. **BCBS-KS** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient M.A., who was treated as an outpatient in this district at Victory Southcross in February 2013 under subscriber number XSB*****. Victory submitted a claim to BCBS-KS in the amount of \$132,626.81 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$2,844.19 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against BCBS-KS will be provided to counsel for BCBS-KS in the form attached at **Exhibit 38**.

99. Defendant Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas City ("**BCBS-KC**") is a corporation of the State of Missouri with its principal place of business located at 2301 Main Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64108. It may be served with process through its registered agent, Mark A. Newcomer, 2301 Main Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64108. BCBS-KC has appeared in this case through its legal counsel, Gonzalez Chiscano Angulo & Kasson, PC and Henry B. Gonzalez, III and **Foley & Lardner, LLP**, Michael A. Naranjo, and Kimberly A. Klinsport.

100. **BCBS-KC** breached plans in Texas, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient C.T., who was treated as an inpatient in Texas at Victory Mid-Cities in June 2014 under subscriber number YBC*****. Victory submitted a claim to BCBS-ID in the amount of \$117,038.76 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$16,639.65 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against BCBS-KC will be provided to counsel for BCBS-KC in the form attached at **Exhibit 39**.

101. Defendant Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Nebraska (“**BCBS-NE**”) is a corporation of the State of Nebraska with its principal place of business located at 1919 Ak-Sar-Ben Drive, Omaha, Nebraska 68106. It may be served with process through its registered agents Gail Sole, P.O. Box 3248, Omaha, Nebraska 68180 and Russell S. Collins, 1919 Ak-Sar-Ben Drive, Omaha, NE 68106. BCBS-NE has appeared in this case through its legal counsel, Gonzalez Chiscano Angulo & Kasson, PC and Henry B. Gonzalez, III and **Foley & Lardner, LLP**, Michael A. Naranjo, and Kimberly A. Klinsport.

102. **BCBS-NE** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient C.M., who was treated as an inpatient in this district at Victory Southcross in May 2013 under subscriber number CAF*****. Victory submitted a claim to BCBS-NE in the amount of \$98,181.43 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$5,573.10 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against BCBS-NE will be provided to counsel for BCBS-NE in the form attached at **Exhibit 40**.

103. Defendant Noridian Mutual Insurance Company d/b/a Blue Cross Blue Shield of North Dakota (“**BCBS-ND**”) is a corporation of the State of North Dakota with its principal place of business at 4510 13th Ave S, Fargo, North Dakota 58121. It may be served with process through its registered agent, C T Corporation System, 314 E Thayer Ave, Bismarck, North Dakota 58501. BCBS-ND has appeared in this case through its legal counsel, Gonzalez Chiscano Angulo & Kasson, PC and Henry B. Gonzalez, III and **Foley & Lardner, LLP**, Michael A. Naranjo, and Kimberly A. Klinsport.

104. **BCBS-ND** breached plans in Texas, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient S.F., who was treated as an outpatient in Texas at Victory Plano in June 2014 under subscriber number YQA*****. Victory submitted a claim to BCBS-ND in the amount of \$11,977.03 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory only received \$1,367.04 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against BCBS-ND will be provided to counsel for BCBS-ND in the form attached at **Exhibit 41**.

105. Defendant Capital BlueCross also known as Capital Blue Cross Blue Shield and Capital Hospital Service (“**Capital BCBS**”) is a corporation of the State of Pennsylvania with a principal place of business located at 2500 Elmerton Avenue, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17110. Capital BCBS may be served with process through its officers, Gary D. St. Hilaire, Michael R. Cleary, or Todd A. Shamash, 2500 Elmerton Ave., Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17177. Capital BCBS has appeared in this case through its legal counsel, Gonzalez Chiscano Angulo & Kasson, PC and Henry B. Gonzalez, III and **Foley & Lardner, LLP**, Michael A. Naranjo, and Kimberly A. Klinsport.

106. **Capital BCBS** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient D.B., who was treated as an inpatient in this district at Victory Landmark in September 2014 under subscriber number PAA*****. Victory submitted a claim to Capital BCBS in the amount of \$54,285.43 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$3,097.51 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against Capital BCBS will be provided to counsel for Capital BCBS in the form attached at **Exhibit 42**.

107. Defendant CareFirst of Maryland, Inc. d/b/a Blue Cross Blue Shield of Maryland, and/or BCBS Care First of Maryland and/or CareFirst Administrators (“**BCBS-MD**”) is a corporation of the State of Maryland with its principal place of business located at 1501 S. Clinton Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21224. It may be served with process through its registered agent, The Corporation Trust Inc., at 351 West Camden Street, Baltimore, Maryland 21201-7912. BCBS-MD has appeared in this case through their legal counsel, **Shamoun & Norman, LLP**, Kenneth J. Lambert, and Brian K. Norman.

108. **BCBS-MD** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient A.C., who was treated as an outpatient in this district at Victory Landmark in December 2013 under subscriber number LYH*****. Victory submitted a claim to BCBS-MD \$13,890.46 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$1,239.44 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against BCBS-MD will be provided to counsel for BCBS-MD in the form attached at **Exhibit 43**. A substantial number of BCBS Subscribers under BCBS-MD plans or under plans for which BCBS-MD was the administrator and had final benefits determination authority with respect to benefits payable under such plans are located in this district and had covered services performed in this district.

109. Group Hospitalization and Medical Services, Inc. d/b/a CareFirst Blue Cross Blue Shield (“**GHMS**”) is a Corporation of Washington, DC with its principal place of business located at 840 First St NE, Mail Stop DC 12-08, Washington DC 20065. It may be served with process through its regular agent, CT Corporation System, 1015 15th St. NW,

Suite 1000, Washington, D.C. 20005. CareFirst BCBS has appeared in this case through its legal counsel, **Shamoun & Norman, LLP**, Kenneth J. Lambert and Brian K. Norman.

110. **GHMS** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient J.B., who was treated as an inpatient in this district at Victory Landmark in December 2014 under subscriber number XIL*****. Victory submitted a claim to GHMS in the amount of \$578,224.33 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$8,896.54 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against GHMS will be provided to counsel for GHMS in the form attached at **Exhibit 44**. A substantial number of BCBS Subscribers under GHMS plans or under plans for which GHMS was the administrator and had final benefits determination authority with respect to benefits payable under such plans are located in this district and had covered services performed in this district.

111. Defendant Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan (“**BCBS-MI**”) is a corporation of the State of Michigan with its principal place of business located at 600 East Lafayette St., Detroit, Michigan 48226. It may be served with process through its registered agent, Marcia Cypress, 600 East Lafayette St., Dept. 2004, Detroit, Michigan 48226. BCBS-MI has appeared in this case through its legal counsel, **Bodman PLC**, Rebecca D. O’Reilly and Bridget M. Hathaway.

112. **BCBS-MI** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by failing to pay benefits related to patient P.G., who was treated as an outpatient in this district at Victory Southcross in May 2013 under subscriber number TQK*****. Victory submitted a claim to BCBS-MI in the amount of \$16,104.53 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However,

Victory received zero dollars (\$0) on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against BCBS-MI will be provided to counsel for BCBS-MI in the form attached at **Exhibit 45**.

113. Defendant BlueCross BlueShield of Tennessee, Inc. (“**BCBS-TN**”) is a corporation of the State of Tennessee with its principal place of business located at 1 Cameron Hill Circle, Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402. It may be served with process through its registered agent, Anne Hance at 1 Cameron Hill Circle, Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402-9815. BCBS-TN has appeared in this case through its legal counsel, **Andrews Kurth Kenyon LLP** and John B. Shely.

114. **BCBS-TN** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by failing to pay benefits related to patient J.K., who was treated as an outpatient in this district at Victory Southcross in December 2013 under subscriber number STV*****. Victory submitted a claim to BCBS-TN in the amount of \$15,140.96 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received zero dollars (\$0) on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against BCBS-TN will be provided to counsel for BCBS-TN in the form attached at **Exhibit 46**.

115. Defendant Lifetime Healthcare, Inc. d/b/a Excellus BlueCross BlueShield, 165 Court Street, Rochester, NY 14642 d/b/a Excellus BlueCross BlueShield (“**Excellus**”) is a corporation of the State of New York with its principal place of business located at 165 Court St., Rochester, New York 14647. It may be served with process through the Secretary of State Rossana Rosado, One Commerce Plaza, 99 Washington Avenue, Albany, NY 12231.

116. **Excellus** breached plans in this district, including for example only and without limitation, by substantially underpaying benefits related to patient A.E., who was treated as an outpatient in this district at Victory Southcross in December 2012 under subscriber number

SLD*****. Victory submitted a claim to Excellus in the amount of \$50,732.47 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received only \$4,490.64 on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against Excellus can be found at **Exhibit 47**.

117. Defendant Blue Cross Blue Shield of Wisconsin d/b/a Anthem Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Wisconsin (“**BCBS-WI**”) is a corporation of the state of Wisconsin with its principal place of business located at N17 W24340 Riverwood Drive Waukesha, Wisconsin 53188. It may be served with process through its registered agent, CT Corporation System at 301 S. Bedford St., Suite 1, Madison, Wisconsin 53703.

118. **BCBS-WI** breached plans in Texas, including for example only and without limitation, by failing to pay benefits related to patient S.S., who was treated as an outpatient in Texas at Victory Mid-Cities in December 2013 under subscriber number MWU*****. Victory submitted a claim to BCBS-TN in the amount of \$26,565.48 through the local Blue Cross Blue Shield affiliate, BCBSTX, for the covered services. However, Victory received zero dollars (\$0) on this claim. Details regarding the specific claims against BCBS-WI can be found at **Exhibit 48**.

Introduction to the Dispute

119. Plaintiffs file this Complaint against Defendants because Defendants have engaged in a pattern of drastically underpaying and refusing to pay Victory for healthcare services claims that Victory has submitted to Defendants for reimbursements. Defendants have consistently and significantly underpaid Victory in amounts in excess of tens of millions of dollars in the aggregate. Defendants have not paid Victory as required by ERISA, other

applicable law, and the governing documents for the healthcare plans directly insured and/or administered by the BCBS Entities (the “BCBS Plans”).

120. Victory consisted of a group of acute care hospitals that provided medical procedures to thousands of insureds of the BCBS Entities. Defendants failed to appropriately reimburse Victory under the terms of the BCBS Plans, including no reimbursement whatsoever for a significant number of medically-appropriate procedures. Plaintiffs seek, among other things, damages for the appropriate reimbursement under those plans pursuant to ERISA as well as under Texas common law for breach of contract for those claims for which appropriate reimbursement is sought that are not governed by ERISA. Moreover, Plaintiffs seek damages based on misrepresentations made by Defendants’ representatives as detailed below.

121. But, this proceeding is about more than failing to pay under the terms of the BCBS Plans. This is also a case about Defendants’ scheme to put out-of-network providers out of business. The BCBS Entities not only used no payments and under payments to apply this pressure, they also made it nearly impossible for Victory to know if they were being properly paid by refusing to release the plan language that is the basis for payment of the claims. Only through the bankruptcy process have Plaintiffs been able to discover the extent to which Defendants have failed to pay according to their obligations under the BCBS Plans by obtaining representative Summary Plan Descriptions (“SPDs”).

122. As part of the bankruptcy process, Plaintiffs have obtained some of the applicable SPDs outlining how Defendants ought to have processed some of the claims at issue in this case. The SPDs currently available to the Plaintiffs show that the claims at issue in this case will be governed generally by the two traditional measures for calculating the benefit

amounts for out-of-network providers: some form of a reasonable and customary charge, and some percentage of what Medicare would pay for the same or similar healthcare services.

123. Moreover, the terms of the SPDs often contradict the terms Victory's representatives were provided by the representatives for the BCBS Entities at the time benefits and eligibility were verified. To the extent that the terms of the actual BCBS Plans provided for reimbursements less than the representations provided by the representatives for the BCBS Entities, Victory performed its medical procedures in reliance on the information provided by the representatives for the BCBS Entities that more favorable terms would control.

124. The BCBS Entities provided health benefit plans and health insurance policies to businesses and individuals throughout the United States, including Texas. The BCBS Entities' plans and policies include individual health benefit plans and employer-sponsored group health plans. The BCBS Entities also acted as a third-party administrator ("TPA") for many of these plans.

125. In many instances, a beneficiary-patient's healthcare benefit plan is governed by the applicable provisions of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act ("ERISA"), 29 U.S.C. § 1001, *et seq.*, state law, and the governing healthcare plan documents. The beneficiary-patient's ERISA health plan is interpreted by the plan administrator, which may be the employer but which can also be a TPA, such as the BCBS Entities, if the plan sponsor delegates or assigns that authority to the TPA.

126. Plaintiffs bring this action under ERISA, state law and federal law, and pursuant to the BCBS Plans. The BCBS Plans at issue allow beneficiary-patients (the "BCBS Subscribers") to obtain healthcare services from facilities that have not entered into contracts with the BCBS Entities (referred to as "out-of-network," or "non-participating" providers) or

from facilities that are “in-network” with the BCBS Entities. At all relevant times, each of the BCBS Entities were the administrator, fiduciary, relevant party-in-interest, and/or the obligor for each of the BCBS Plans they administered. Each of the BCBS Entities was responsible for making final benefit decisions and the extent of payment on claims submitted by Victory. For all intents and purposes relevant to this proceeding, each of the BCBS Entities essentially were the BCBS Plans with respect to those each administered.

127. Under the BCBS Plans and applicable law, the BCBS Entities are required to promptly pay benefits for out-of-network services based on the terms provided in the BCBS Plans. The applicable manner in which benefits are determined is contained in the SPD provided to each BCBS Subscriber. Depending on the specific BCBS Plan, those methodologies include:

- some version of the Reasonable and Customary or Usual and Customary rate,
- a percentage of Medicare rates or a Medicare-like reimbursement, which varies by plan, or
- other rate(s) as otherwise defined in the applicable plans.

The contractually applicable methodology for each BCBS Plan is contained in the SPD provided to each BCBS Subscriber.

128. Although Defendants have withheld plan documents as described above, as of the time of filing of this Amended Complaint, plaintiffs currently possess copies of a portion of the applicable SPDs.

129. A significant number of those SPDs provide that out-of-network hospital services will be reimbursed according to a percentage of the reasonable and customary charges for the same or similar services established for the area. In some SPDs, those rates are described as an “Allowed Amount” or “Allowable Charge.” For example, employees of Arcadian

Ambulance Service, Inc. have a plan administered by BCBS-LA. Providers treating those employees (or their family members) in Texas submit claims to BCBSTX, the “Host Blue” plan as required in the SPD. The BCBS-LA plan reimburses out-of-network, or “nonparticipating healthcare providers” for 50% of covered services based upon an Allowable Charge, determined as “The lesser of the billed charge or the amount established by the Claims Administrator or negotiated as the maximum allowed for all Provider services covered under the terms of this Benefit Plan.” The BCBS-LA SPD further provides that the insured’s liability for services rendered by “non-participating healthcare providers ... will generally be based on either the Host Blue’s non-participating healthcare provider local payment or the pricing arrangements required by applicable state law.”

130. Employees of Lowe’s, Inc. are covered by BCBS-AL and also have out-of-network benefits determined as an Allowed Amount. Under the BCBS-AL plan, non-network hospital services are reimbursed at 50% of the allowed amount. For providers who are both out-of-network and out of state, like Victory, the plan states that the allowed amount will be calculated “by the Blue Cross and/or Blue Shield plan where services are rendered,” in this case by BCBSTX. The BCBS-AL SPD provides that the Allowed Amount:

may be based on the negotiated rate payable to in-network providers or may be based on the average charge for the care in the area. In other cases, Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Alabama determines the allowed amount using historical data and information from various sources, such as, but not limited to:

- The charge or average charge for the same or a similar service;
- Pricing data from the local Blue Cross and/or Blue Shield plan where services are rendered;
- The relative complexity of the service;
- The in-network allowance in Alabama for the same or a similar service;
- Applicable state health care factors;
- The rate of inflation using a recognized measure; and

- Other reasonable limits, as may be required with respect to outpatient prescription drug costs.

131. Employees of EGS Electrical Group are also covered by an SPD administered by BCBS-AL which contains the same definition for Allowed Amount but reimburses at least 60% of the allowed amount.

132. Employees of Walmart, Inc. are covered by an SPD administered by BAA. Services provided out-of-network are reimbursed at 50% of Maximum Allowable Charge, which is defined in the SPD as “the amount of a provider’s charge (whether in network or out-of-network) paid to providers in a given geographic area, as determined by the Third Party Administrator.”

133. Employees of Dollar General are covered by an SPD administered by BCBS-TN. Benefits are paid for hospital and surgery services rendered by non-network providers at 50% or 60% (based upon an insured’s wellness credits) of Maximum Allowed Charge, defined by the SPD as:

The amount that the Plan, at its sole discretion, has determined to be the maximum amount payable for a Covered Service. That determination will be based upon [BCBS-TN]'s contract with a Network Provider or the amount payable based on the administrator's fee schedule for the Covered Services rendered by Out-of-Network Providers.

134. Employees of Duphill, Inc. receive health benefits under an SPD administered by BCBS-LA. Payment for services provided out-of-network and out-of-state are based upon the Allowable Charge, or:

When covered healthcare services are provided outside of the Company’s service area by Non-Participating healthcare providers, the amount(s) a Member pays for such services will generally be based on either the Host Blue’s Non-Participating healthcare provider local payment or the pricing arrangements required by applicable state law.

135. As a further example relying specifically upon “reasonable and customary” language, employees of Bridgestone Americas Inc. have a health plan administered by BCBS-TN, which provides that out-of-network hospital and surgery services will be reimbursed “at 70% of the ‘reasonable and customary’ fees after the deductible is met.”

136. Employees of Family Dollar Stores, Inc. are reimbursed for out-of-network hospital services at 50% of an “Allowed Amount” calculated under an SPD from BCBS-NC based upon charges from comparable providers:

for PROVIDERS that have not entered into an agreement with BCBSNC, the allowed amount will be the lesser of the PROVIDER'S billed charge or an amount based on an OUT-OF-NETWORK fee schedule established by BCBSNC that is applied to comparable PROVIDERS for similar services under a similar health benefit plan. Where BCBSNC has not established an out-of-network fee schedule amount for the billed service, the allowed amount will be the lesser of the PROVIDER'S billed charge or a charge established by BCBSNC using a methodology that is applied to comparable PROVIDERS who may have entered into an agreement with BCBSNC for similar services under a similar health benefit plan.

137. Employees of Genuine Parts Company (“GPC”) are covered by an SPD administered by BCBS-AL that reimburses out-of-network providers a percentage of their reasonable and customary charges. “The GPC Medical Plan pays its share of Reasonable and Customary medical expenses. Reasonable and customary expenses are the usual fees charged by health care providers with similar training and experience in the same geographic area in which the service is obtained as determined by the Claims Administrator.” For out-of-network hospital services, BCBS must reimburse 70% of reasonable and customary expenses, after the insured has met his deductible.

138. Victory reasonably expected to be reimbursed for its usual charges based on the payment methodologies set forth in the BCBS Subscribers’ SPDs. Because Victory did not have access to the SPDs, it was required to rely upon the verifications of coverage and

eligibility provided by the BCBS Entities prior to services being rendered. Had the BCBS Entities disclosed to Victory, prior to the services, that the expected reimbursement would be less than thirty-percent of Victory's usual charges, Victory would not have provided the covered services. For each of the claims at issue in this case, Victory has been reimbursed less than thirty-percent of its usual charges, and for some of the asserted claims, Victory has received no payment at all from the BCBS Entities.

139. Where services were provided to BCBS Subscribers under SPDs stating that reimbursement would be based upon reasonable and customary rates or an allowed amount or allowed charge, the out-of-network hospital reimbursement rate would reasonably be expected, at a minimum, to exceed 30% of Victory's billed charges (after patient obligations, such as deductibles and co-pays). However, all of the asserted claims in this case were paid below that rate.

140. A number of BCBS Subscribers treated at Victory facilities are subject to SPDs that determine reimbursement for covered services rendered by an out-of-network provider based upon a percentage of the applicable Medicare reimbursement rate (after patient obligations, such as deductibles or co-pays). For example, employees of Lifetouch have an SPD administered by BCBS-MN which determines an allowed amount for nonparticipating providers using one of the following methods:

(1) based upon a Minnesota nonparticipating provider fee schedule posted at the Claims Administrator's website; (2) a percentage, not less than 100%, of the Medicare allowed charge for the same or similar service; (3) a percentage of billed charges; (4) pricing determined by another Blue Cross or Blue Shield plan; or (5) pricing based upon a nationwide provider reimbursement database.

141. Any reimbursement based upon a percentage of the Medicare rate would reasonably be expected to exceed 30% of Victory's billed charges (after patient obligations,

such as deductibles or co-pays). However, all of the asserted claims in this case were paid below that rate.

142. On information and belief, the SPDs' out-of-network payment/reimbursement provisions discussed above are representative of the out-of-network payment/reimbursement obligations for each of the plans that govern the underlying claims at issue in this case. In turn, on information and belief, each of the underlying claims at issue in this case should have been reimbursed, at a minimum, at a rate exceeding 30% of Victory's usual and customary charges. In addition, Victory's billed charges were calculated based upon, *inter alia*, Victory's costs and standard fee schedule, making Victory's charges reasonable and customary. Thus, based upon the representative SPDs currently available to Victory, each of the underlying claims at issue in this case should have been reimbursed, at a minimum, at a rate exceeding 30% of Victory's usual and customary charges.

143. Upon information and belief, the BCBS Entities' management responsibilities for many of the BCBS Plans are memorialized in agreements with the BCBS Plans (those Agreements are referred to herein as "Master Services Agreements" including Administrative Services Only Agreements). Pursuant to the Master Services Agreements, the BCBS Entities earned fees for the services they provided. Upon information and belief, the BCBS Entities earned additional compensation based on "savings" that they achieved for the BCBS Plans, such as the systematic underpayment of Victory's claims.

144. Despite its best efforts, Victory could not remain in business, in part driven by the lack of appropriate payments by the BCBS Entities. The Victory entities filed for bankruptcy in June 2015.

145. With respect to all or nearly all of the claims at issue, the Blue Cross Entities used BCBSTX as an agent/representative while dealing with Victory. This included, without limitation, the verification of coverage and benefits, pre-certifications, administration of claims and appeals, and benefit/payment determinations described herein. Defendants are liable for these acts, omissions, and misrepresentations of their agent/authorized representative, BCBSTX. BCBSTX is a division of Health Care Service Corporation (licensee of Defendant Blue Cross and Blue Shield Association for five states, including Texas). BCBSTX and Health Care Service Corporation are subject to personal jurisdiction in Texas, including in the Western District of Texas, because of their continuous and systematic business contacts in Texas and the Western District of Texas and because BCBSTX's wrongful actions in this matter (including the wrongful misrepresentations and benefits determinations alleged herein) took place in the Western District of Texas and/or caused injury in the Western District of Texas by, among other things, resulting in the denial of benefits that were to be received in this district.

Additional Factual Background

I. Victory consisted of out-of-network facilities.

146. Health care providers are either "in-network" or "out-of-network" with respect to insurance carriers. "In-network" providers are those who contract with health insurers to accept payments in full at rates discounted from their usual and customary charges for covered services in exchange for such insurers steering patients to their facilities and thereby increasing the providers' volume. "Out-of-network" providers are those that do not have contracts with insurance carriers to accept discounted rates from their usual and customary charges. Victory was an out-of-network provider.

147. Victory prominently advised its patients and the public of its out-of-network status. Documents identifying Victory as an out-of-network hospital were provided to patients when they entered the Victory hospitals and when they agree to receive treatment. In addition, signs in the admitting area of the Victory hospitals informed patients that Victory was an out-of-network hospital.

148. Defendants charged the BCBS Subscribers higher premiums for the inclusion of “out-of-network” benefits in their BCBS Plans. BCBS Subscribers may choose an out-of-network provider for a variety of reasons, such as the quality of care and amenities available at a particular facility or access to a specific doctor, as is the patient-beneficiary’s choice under the BCBS Plans. Despite the foregoing, and despite Victory’s out-of-network status, BCBS Subscribers frequently sought treatment at Victory.

II. Victory received a complete Assignment of claims against Defendants for the healthcare services Victory provided to the BCBS Subscribers.

149. Upon registration at Victory, all patients, including BCBS Subscribers, executed an assignment of claims/benefits form, among other documents. In the Assignment, BCBS Subscribers irrevocably and fully assigned to Victory their rights to benefits, claims, and causes of action under the BCBS Plans, including the right to sue the Defendants for benefits and breach of other duties, including fiduciary duties.

150. With regard to all BCBS Subscribers, prior to or at the time of treatment, as a condition to providing treatment, Victory required that they sign documents whereby Victory obtained an assignment and transfer of all causes of action and claims (“Assignment”) from each BCBS Subscriber. Under each Assignment, Victory acquired the BCBS Subscriber’s benefit rights under the BCBS Plans with respect to both ERISA and non-ERISA governed plans. Victory did not waive a deductible or co-payment by the acceptance of the Assignment.

As an assignee, Victory obtained standing to sue Defendants under ERISA as well as under other applicable law. All of the assignments to each of the Victory hospitals use the same or substantially the same language assigning the BCBS Subscribers' benefits to Victory:

[Patient] does hereby sell, transfer, convey, grant, and irrevocably and forever assign to [Victory] all known and unknown, past, present, and future rights, title and interest in all claims, causes of action (i.e., pursuant to common law, statute, or in equity and whether based upon tort, breach of contract, breach of fiduciary duty, or otherwise), insurance benefits, health care benefits and all other legal rights or recovery from/against: ... (ii) any and all health plans pursuant to which Assignor and/or Patient are entitled to receive health benefits and/or money to pay for medical care, hospital care, medical devices or treatment; (iii) any and all Administrators and/or Fiduciaries of all health plans pursuant to which Assignor and/or Patient are entitled to receive health benefits and/or money to pay for medical care, hospital care, medical devices or treatment, damages or loss (i.e., for breaches of any fiduciary duties by said Administrators and/or Fiduciaries); (iv) any and all insurance companies pursuant to which Assignor and/or Patient are entitled to receive any benefits, proceeds and/or money to pay for medical care, hospital care, medical devices or treatment, damages, losses, bodily injury, and/or property damages ... (vii) any and all individuals, companies, governmental agencies, governmental entities, and all other responsible third parties which are, or may be, legally and/or financially responsible in any way for the injuries or damages to the Patient and/or the Assignor for any and/or all damages, loss or expense suffered/incurred by the Patient and/or Assignor as a result of any negligence, recklessness, intentional action or inaction, or for any violation of/failure to comply with any statute or regulation.

151. Attached hereto as **Exhibit 49** and incorporated herein by reference, are copies of exemplar assignments whereby Victory obtained assignment and transfer of causes of action and claims from BCBS Subscribers. These assignments are representative of the assignments at issue in this matter.

152. In this case there are at issue self-funded plans which the BCBS Entities administer, as well as fully-funded plans which the BCBS Entities issue. When the BCBS Entities insure a plan directly, as well as when they exercised discretionary authority or control of self-insured plans, the BCBS Entities act as a fiduciary. The BCBS Entities therefore owed fiduciary duties to all members and subscribers in its ERISA plans and also to Victory's

facilities as beneficiaries and assignees of the assignments of benefits and rights executed by the BCBS Subscribers who received services at those facilities. As the assignee of the BCBS Subscriber, Victory stands in their shoes and has all rights they would have to enforce the terms and benefits of the BCBS Plans.

153. Upon information and belief, most of the BCBS Plans did not prohibit the BCBS Subscribers from assigning their rights to benefits under the BCBS Plans to Victory, including the right of direct payment of benefits under the BCBS Plans to Victory.

154. Moreover, to the extent that any of the BCBS Plans prohibited the assignment of benefits to Victory, Defendants have waived any purported anti-assignment provisions, have ratified the assignment of benefits to Victory, and/or are estopped from using any purported anti-assignment provisions against Victory due to their course of dealing with and statements to Victory as an out-of-network provider. Through the verification process and claim submission (which included a written disclosure of an assignment) the Defendants were aware that the BCBS Subscribers had executed valid assignments in favor of Victory and the Defendants have not raised any anti-assignment concerns.

155. Additionally, to the extent that any of the BCBS Plans prohibited the assignment of benefits to Victory, any such purported anti-assignment prohibitions are unenforceable as, among other things, contrary to public policy, as adhesion contracts, and/or due to a lack of privity with Victory.

156. In addition to receipt of the Assignment, before admitting a patient, Victory would contact Defendants by telephone to verify the patient's benefits: that he/she had insurance, that the insurance plan at issue provided for out-of-network benefits, whether there were limitations or exclusions applicable, and what the patient deductible, out-of-pocket

maximum, and coinsurance were. Victory would also ask how the BCBS Plan covering the BCBS Subscriber at issue determined the out-of-network benefits for the procedure(s) at issue.

III. Defendants drastically underpaid Victory's claims for reimbursement.

157. Victory treated over 1,800 BCBS Subscribers subject to this lawsuit at Victory hospitals and accordingly billed Defendants for the medical services provided to these BCBS Subscribers. Victory's total charges for these claims was approximately \$116,376,352.79 in the aggregate, reflecting the usual and customary fees for the particular medical services provided at Victory.

158. However, to date, Defendants have reimbursed Victory for only a fraction of this amount—approximately \$12,481,839.08 in the aggregate. Even factoring in amounts that Defendants contend are the patients' responsibility under the applicable BCBS Plans (*i.e.*, the BCBS Subscriber's co-payments, coinsurance, and deductibles), the total payments made by Defendants are a mere fraction of the total usual and customary charges—leaving an unpaid balance due of approximately \$43,162,553.66 on these 1896 accounts/claims.³

159. Attached hereto as Schedules 1a and 1b are summaries of the claims as issue in this lawsuit broken down by each Plaintiff against each Defendant. Schedules 1a and 1b are incorporated herein for all purposes. The summaries provide the aggregate amount of charges, insurance payments, the patient's estimated share (*i.e.*, co-pay, deductible and co-insurance), and balance due (based on the out-of-network benefits under the BCBS Plans) for each of the Victory hospitals and each of the Defendants, as well as the number of BCBS Subscribers' claims. Attached as Exhibits 1 through 48 and incorporated herein for all purposes are

³ Schedules 1a and 1b include a summary of these claims, broken down by facility (*e.g.*, Victory Landmark, Victory Beaumont, etc.) and by Defendant (*e.g.*, BCBS-AL, BCBS-AR, etc.).

spreadsheets applicable to each defendant that give the following claim-by-claim details: the identity of the underlying patient by initials, the associated hospital facility, the date of the relevant procedure(s), the charges to the underlying patient, the specific defendant involved, and the associated plan's reimbursements (if any).

160. In violation of their duties under ERISA, the BCBS Plans, and state law, Defendants have: i) failed and refused to pay Victory appropriately for health care services that Victory has provided to BCBS Subscribers who are covered by BCBS Plans; ii) failed and refused to provide a full and fair review of Victory's charges; and iii) failed and refused to provide a meaningful review and appeal process.

161. Specifically, Victory treated approximately 1,896 BCBS Subscribers at issue in this lawsuit⁴ at the Victory facilities and accordingly submitted claims to Defendants for the medical services provided to these BCBS Subscribers. Victory's aggregate usual and customary charges for these claims was approximately \$116,376,352.79 in the aggregate, reflecting the usual and customary charges for the particular medical services provided at the Victory facilities. Before rendering such services, Victory received coverage verification that the services to be rendered by Victory were covered under the BCBS Plans. Victory relied on those communications from Defendants, and without such assurances, Victory would not have provided the proposed medical services to the BCBS Subscribers.

162. However, to date, Defendants have reimbursed Victory only a fraction of its usual and customary charges and the amounts provided for under the BCBS Plans. For many

⁴ Victory treated over 4,000 BCBS Subscribers during the relevant time period, but for purposes of this lawsuit, Victory brings claims related to the 1,896 BCBS Subscribers for which Victory was paid 30% or less of Victory's submitted charges. The BCBS Subscribers at issue in this lawsuit do not include those for which Victory was paid more than 30% of its usual and customary charges. Victory reserves the right to bring claims relating to the remaining BCBS Subscribers.

BCBS Subscribers, Victory provided treatment but received *zero* (approximately 303 claims with aggregate charges of approximately \$7.9 million received zero reimbursement) or *extremely low* (meaning 30% or less of billed charges) reimbursement from Defendants. Even factoring in amounts that Defendants contend are the patients' responsibility under the applicable BCBS Plans (*i.e.*, the BCBS Subscriber's co-payments, coinsurance, and deductibles), the total payments by Defendants are a mere fraction of Victory's total usual and customary charges. Defendants' payment shortfalls leave an aggregate unpaid balance of approximately \$43,162,553.66 million in the aggregate on these 1,896 accounts/claims. Defendants' pattern of dramatically underpaying Victory is in clear violation of the terms of the BCBS Plans covering the BCBS Subscribers, as well as state and federal law.

163. Because of Defendants' practices, Victory has been reimbursed in amounts substantially less than what it should have been paid pursuant to the healthcare plans of their subscriber patients and, in some instances, nothing at all. Examples of Defendants' significant underpayments are provided above in paragraphs 15-118. Defendants pursued standard and uniform policies in making reimbursement determinations in a fashion that conflicted with their contractual obligations under the BCBS Plans and constituted an abuse of discretion. In addition, Defendants misrepresented to its members/subscribers (*i.e.*, the BCBS Subscribers) and the assignee thereof, Victory, that the methods used to calculate benefits were based on valid data or legitimate reasons.

164. As a further example of the Defendants' uniform system of underpayment, Victory Landmark patient C.S. (Account No. LK*****), underwent an inpatient surgery for a decompressive lumbar laminectomy on October 25, 2013. Prior to rendering any services, Victory verified the patient's coverage with BCBS-TN on October 15, 2013. BCBS-TN

informed Victory that the patient's plan provided for reimbursement at the reasonable and customary rate, and BCBS-TN authorized the surgery and three days admittance to Victory Landmark under Authorization No. L00*****. After the services were provided and the patient discharged, Victory initially submitted a claim to BCBS-TN for \$415,310.37 on October 31, 2013. On November 11, 2013, Victory submitted a corrected claim to BCBS-TN for \$418,110.37. Victory inquired about the status of the claim on November 25, 2013 and was informed by BCBS-TN that the corrected claim was in processing with no additional information required. On December 7, 2013, Victory again inquired about the status of the claim and was informed by BCBS-TN that the claim had been processed and would be paid at \$9,935.31 based upon BCBS-TN's determination of an allowed amount of \$21,050.62. Victory spoke with a BCBS-TN representative on January 14, 2014 regarding the underpayment and subsequently filed an appeal the same day. Victory submitted another appeal on February 14, 2016 and continued to correspond with BCBS-TN regarding the underpayment. On August 18, 2016, BCBS-TN again denied the remainder of Victory's claim. On September 28, 2016, Victory spoke with another BCBS-TN representative who disclosed that the claim was determined based upon local pricing despite not having access to the applicable SPD. On October 4, 2016, nearly two years after the patient received services from Victory, Victory requested the SPD from BCBS-TN, and on the following day was informed by BCBS-TN that it was continuing to research the claim. BCBS-TN was unable to provide the requested SPD, requiring Victory to request it from the Plan Sponsor. Although Victory continued to follow-up with BCBS-TN as recently as November 3, 2016, no additional payments were made by BCBS-TN. BCBS-TN verified benefits to be paid at usual and customary charges; however,

the allowed amount dictated by BCBS-TN is even lower than if benefits had been determined as a percentage of Medicare.

165. Another example is patient B.T. (Account No. LK*****), who was treated at Victory Landmark on December 7, 2013. Prior to providing any services, Victory verified B.T.'s benefits on December 3, 2013, with a representative for ABCBS-OH, who indicated that reimbursement would be based upon usual and customary charges. ABCBS-OH also preauthorized the procedure under Authorization No. 02*****. Victory submitted an initial claim to ABCBS-OH on December 23, 2013. Victory's total billed charges for the procedure and inpatient stay totaled \$104,259.21 (submitted as a corrected claim on January 22, 2014 and again on April 3, 2014); however, ABCBS-OH paid a total of \$27,016.61 on the claim. Despite preauthorizing the services, ABCBS-OH indicated that \$35,800.53 was not covered. Victory appealed, and ABCBS-OH maintained that the claim had been processed correctly. When Victory followed up again on June 29, 2015, the representative for ABCBS-OH indicated that the corrected claim had not been received until May 8, 2015 (more than a year after it had been submitted) and would require thirty days to process. On February 2, 2016, ABCBS-OH refused to make any adjustments to the benefit amount.

166. In a separate representative instance, BCBS-LA verified coverage for patient H.K. (Account No. 50*****) on January 9, 2013 and informed Victory that benefits would be reimbursed according to the allowed amount. BCBS-LA pre-authorized the patient's anterior lumbar fusion under Authorization No. AA*****. Relying upon the information provided by BCBS-LA's representative, Victory Southcross treated patient H.K. on January 11, 2013. After the patient was discharged on January 14, 2013, Victory submitted a claim for \$622,815.95. On February 18, 2013, Victory inquired with BCBS-LA about the claim and was

informed that the claim was in processing with no additional information required. Then, on February 27, 2013, Victory again checked with BCBS-LA regarding the claim and was informed that the claim had been denied based on termination of the patient's policy; however, BCBS-LA was not able to provide Victory with an alleged termination date until March 15, 2015, at which time the BCBS-LA representative stated that the BCBS Subscriber's benefits were terminated October 31, 2012. Victory appealed, but to date no payments have been received on this claim despite BCBS-LA's confirmation of benefits and pre-authorization.

167. The underpayment of the claims related to patient C.S. by BCBS-TN, to patient B.T. by ABCBS-OH, and to patient H.K. by BCBS-LA are representative of the Defendants' systematic underpayment of all the claims at issue in this case as set forth in Exhibits 1-48 and in Schedules 1a and 1b.

IV. Defendants violate the terms of the BCBS Plans.

168. The BCBS Plans provide for payment of Victory's services to BCBS Subscribers at various rates set forth in the applicable BCBS Plans. Victory's total submitted charges reflect Victory's usual and customary fees for the particular medical services provided at Victory. The payments Defendants made to Victory (even after factoring in amounts that Defendants contend are the patients' responsibility under the applicable BCBS Plans, such as the BCBS Subscriber's co-payments, co-insurance, and deductibles) fell far short of the reimbursement required under the BCBS Plans.

169. BCBS Subscribers would choose a Victory facility because of the superior quality of service and the hands-on service Victory provided. Infection rates at Victory facilities were extremely low. Victory provided its patients with unique convenience and highly specialized services. Victory offered amenities not offered in most hospitals, such as one-on-one nursing care.

170. Significantly, BCBS Subscribers who sought treatment at Victory paid higher premiums, at times substantially higher premiums, in order to have the right under the BCBS Plans to receive medical treatment from the provider of their choice, including from out-of-network providers such as Victory. They bargained for and expected that payment be made at the reimbursement rates provided in the BCBS Plans for the rendering of medical treatment for BCBS Subscribers. Defendants' actual reimbursements to Victory fell far below these reasonable expectations, leaving higher amounts as the patient responsibility.

171. After providing medical services to a BCBS Subscriber, Victory's facilities would send a claim to the BCBS Entities. Under the BCBS Plans, the BCBS Entities are supposed to determine the out-of-network benefits for services provided, apply the various metrics discussed above, and arrive at a reimbursement under the applicable BCBS Plans. The BCBS Entities make this determination in the normal course of business. BCBS exercised discretionary authority and/or discretionary control over the BCBS Plans which they administered, which the Plan Sponsors, with whom the BCBS Entities had contracts, have unequivocally yielded to the BCBS Entities.

172. Defendants acted as the plan and claim administrators and as fiduciaries to the beneficiaries for each of the claims at issue in this case. Defendants exercised discretion, authority, control and oversight in determining if plan benefits would be paid and the amounts of plan benefits that would be paid. Defendants' administration of these claims resulted in the payment of a just a fraction of usual, customary, and reasonable rates for medical services rendered, and in all cases substantially less than the reimbursement rates required under the BCBS Plans.

173. The BCBS Entities ignored the BCBS Plans and processed claims according to some methodology not to be found in the BCBS Plans. Moreover, the BCBS Entities also did not pay anything on a significant portion of claims.

174. In addition to underpayments or zero payments, Defendants engaged in other conduct that delayed or reduced payments to Victory in violation of the BCBS Plans and the law, including but not limited to:

- “No written explanation” – where Defendants failed to provide a written explanation for situations where they did not pay the full amount billed or did not pay in accordance with the applicable BCBS Plan.
- “Inaccurate reasons provided” – where Defendants justified non-payment or inadequate payment based on inaccurate reasons.
- “Misinterpretation” – where Defendants admit to having misinterpreted its BCBS Plan documents when paying charges, resulting in non-payment or underpayment, but then refuse to correct the payment.⁵
- “Skewed Fee Schedules” – where Defendants used fee schedules and other metrics to determine allowable amounts under the BCBS Plans when such fee schedules and other metrics were skewed heavily in BCBS’s favor and did not represent accurate and fair data upon which to determine the allowable amount.
- “Inappropriate offsets” – where Defendants “offset” past payments they actually made to Victory by offsetting those payments against future claims, resulting in low or zero paid on the subsequent invoice(s).⁶
- “Failing to refer to the plan” – where Defendants would tell Victory that they did not have the plan document available to confirm how claims were processed

⁵ Defendants were consistently slow to correct mistakes and underpayment with Victory, even in those few cases where Defendants did make corrections. Defendants would delay the process and drag out even those payments which were corrected for Victory. But, when Defendants believed that they had overpaid a claim, Defendants would immediately take action to “recoup” the overpayment.

⁶ The result was a *de facto* adverse benefits determination on the account against which Defendants “offset” the charges and, potentially, also as to the account “paid” by these “offsets.” But, in violation of ERISA, Defendants failed to provide an adequate explanation of benefits for the “offset” charges. Moreover, the “offsets” were not authorized, not supported by any agreement or law, and were an improper and unlawful self-help remedy.

and/or paid.

175. Victory has provided Defendants with all information necessary to adjudicate and process the claims at issue. Yet, even after Victory's repeated requests, Defendants have refused to correct blatant underpayments and cease their wrongful conduct.

176. Defendants have wrongly failed to pay in accordance with the terms of the BCBS Plan documents. Defendants have also wrongly made claim determinations without valid or appropriate data and/or without adequate reasons to support reduced payments. Defendants' method of processing Victory's claims was disingenuous and arbitrary, and resulted in Defendants severely underpaying Victory's claims.

177. Defendants' arbitrary method of determining and paying claims ignored the requirements of the BCBS Plans, as well as the history of claim processing between Defendants and Victory. Defendants' benefit decisions were not reasonable, nor were they supported by the evidence available to Defendants. Moreover, such decisions were arbitrary and made in bad faith.

178. The BCBS Plan documents specify how Defendants are required to pay out-of-network healthcare providers, but Defendants have failed to comply with those requirements when processing claims and/or paying (or failing to pay) Victory. Either Defendants wholly failed to comply with the BCBS Plan requirements or their interpretation of the payment provisions in the BCBS Plans was arbitrary and an abuse of discretion.

V. Victory exhausted available internal appeals remedies.

179. Victory has used all reasonable efforts to exhaust available appeals avenues under the BCBS Plans and followed applicable appeal procedures to convince Defendants to reimburse Victory properly on the claims for medical services that Victory provided to the BCBS Subscribers.

180. Despite exhausting the appeal procedures, Defendants have failed to reimburse Victory for the health care services Victory provided to BCBS Subscribers, and approximately \$43.2 million in the aggregate remains due and owing to Victory for these services.

181. Defendants routinely denied appeals without any meaningful explanation and in some cases they failed to respond to the appeal at all. Moreover, despite Victory's appeals, Defendants have failed to adequately explain the basis for their dramatic underpayments to Victory as required by applicable law. In particular, Defendants have failed or refused to: (a) provide written notice of benefit determinations within ninety (90) days of claim submission; (b) provide the specific reason or reasons for the denial of claims; (c) provide the specific plan provisions relied upon to support the denials; (d) provide the specific rule, guideline or protocol relied upon in making the decision to deny claims; (e) describe any additional material or information necessary to perfect a claim, such as the appropriate diagnosis/treatment code; and/or (f) notify the relevant parties that they are entitled to have, free of charge, all documents, records and other information relevant to the claims for benefits.

182. Other examples of Defendants' failure to follow appropriate claims processing procedures include:

- Form letter denials where the reason for the denial is left blank;
- Form letter denials where the reason for the denial does not address in any way the basis for Victory's appeal;
- Failing to respond to an appeal far longer than provided for under ERISA, then belatedly issuing a denial based on the untimely filing of appeals which were timely filed;
- Denying groups of claims together by deeming them paid correctly and never addressing the individual bases for the separate appeals.
- Advising their customer service representatives not to release plan language to providers to ensure that the providers remain in the dark over what the appropriate reimbursement should be and the fact that the BCBS Entities were

not reimbursing according to plan terms.

- Failing to timely process correct claims and leaving open superseded claims so that when the corrected claim is finally processed it is denied as a “duplicate claim” because the original claim was left open.

183. The foregoing tactics in many instances essentially prevented Victory from complying with all appeal procedures. In cases where the internal appeal process may not have been exhausted, full exhaustion is excused because Defendants deprived Victory of meaningful access to administrative remedies and/or further attempts to appeal would have been futile. For example, Defendants failed to follow claims procedures required under ERISA §503, and the Department of Labor’s regulatory requirements in 29 C.F.R. § 2560, 503-1(f) and (g)(1), as described above. In addition, Defendants repeatedly denied claims aggregating more than tens of millions of dollars and refused to provide the information necessary for Victory to make an appropriate appeal. Victory had exhausted its appeals on a substantial number of such claims and, in light of Defendants’ repeated failure to offer any meaningful administrative process for challenging their denials of these claims, it was simply futile for Victory to pursue administrative appeals as to the remaining claims.

VI. Defendants made numerous material misrepresentations

184. Before performing services on BCBS Subscribers, Victory received verification of benefits from the BCBS Entities. Victory would verify the insured’s benefit levels and that no exclusions applied. As part of that process, many times the BCBS Entities would provide the basis upon which they would determine the out-of-network benefits. As noted above, discovery in the bankruptcy proceedings has revealed that the BCBS Entities would often provide a basis during verification that was more advantageous to Victory than the actual terms contained in the applicable plan for determining the allowed amount. For example, on many occasions BCBS would verify that the out-of-network benefits would be determined by the

hospital's usual and customary charge or some form of reasonable and customary rate. Victory subsequently learned that the BCBS Plans provided for a different method of determining the out-of-network benefits which produced a lower overall reimbursement than would the usual and customary or reasonable and customary methods that were verified.

185. In such instances, Victory has a separate cause of action for the difference between the actual amount of reimbursement, if any, and the amount represented by BCBS representatives to Victory during verification.

186. By confirming coverage in this manner, the BCBS Entities made a clear and definite promise to Victory as to the way out-of-network benefits would be determined and paid. These unambiguous promises constitute obligations the BCBS Entities owe to Victory independent of the obligations the BCBS Entities owe under the applicable BCBS Plans.

187. Victory did not have access to any of the applicable plans covering the BCBS Subscribers and therefore had to rely upon the information provided by the BCBS Entities' representatives in order to determine whether and at what amounts Victory would be reimbursed for services performed for BCBS Subscribers.

188. Based upon these representations, Victory provided services to the BCBS Subscribers. Victory's reliance on these representations was foreseeable to the BCBS Entities. Through their communications with Victory, the BCBS Entities knew that Victory was attempting to determine coverage information for BCBS Subscribers. And so, Victory reasonably relied upon these representations in providing medical services to the BCBS Subscribers.

189. The examples provided above in paragraphs 164 and 165, in which BCBS-TN verified patient C.S.'s benefits under a reasonable and customary methodology and in which

ABCBS-OH verified patient B.T.'s benefits under usual and customary but reimbursed Victory using some other metric are representative of the Defendants' practices related to all Victory's misrepresentation claims.

190. Victory's reliance upon the BCBS Entities' coverage and benefit payment promises was detrimental to Victory's business operations and cash flow. After providing these medical procedures to BCBS Subscribers, Victory submitted proper claims to the BCBS Entities for payment of benefits in accordance with representations made by BCBS Entities.

191. Despite their obligation to pay each claim, the BCBS Entities failed, and continue to fail, to pay Victory in a manner consistent with the representations made by its agents and its unambiguous promise to pay for the services provided to its members. The BCBS Entities are required to pay Victory in a manner consistent with the statements made to Victory while confirming coverage and benefits.

192. As a direct and proximate result of its reliance on the BCBS Entities' unambiguous representations, Victory has been harmed in excess of \$31.3 million dollars in the aggregate in connection with approximately 777 claims for which the BCBS Entities' representatives verified that the out-of-network benefits would be determined by the usual and customary charges or reasonable and customary rates. Attached hereto is Schedule 2, which includes a summary of these claims broken down by facility against each BCBS Entity. Schedule 2 is incorporated herein for all purposes. More specifically, for each of these 777 claims, the defendant associated with the claim misrepresented the method of calculating benefits through its agent BCBS of Texas for that claim at the time of verification by representing that the services for the underlying patient would be reimbursed at the plaintiff hospital's "usual and customary charge" or that they would be reimbursed at a "reasonable and

customary rate.” In addition, **Exhibits 1-48** contain detailed spreadsheets containing the following information for each of these 777 claims: the relevant plaintiff hospital; the relevant defendant; the underlying patient’s initials; whether the relevant misrepresentation was that services would be reimbursed at Plaintiffs’ “usual and customary charge” or that they would be reimbursed at a “reasonable and customary rate.”

VII. The BCBS Entities’ failed to provide Plan documents

193. The civil enforcement section of ERISA, particularly 502(c), codified at 29 U.S.C. § 1132(c)(1)(B), provides that a participant or beneficiary is entitled to request claims rejection information from the administrator. If the administrator does not provide the information within thirty days, the administrator may be liable for up to \$100 a day, per claim. As noted above, the BCBS Entities acted as the claims administrator and thus are liable for the penalties for failure to produce the requested documents.

194. Victory has requested from the BCBS Entities both plan and plan associated documents on claims made by Victory. The BCBS Entities have refused to provide these documents. Victory is entitled to the requested plan documents and associated documents. Victory is also entitled to a civil penalty of \$100 per day for the failure to timely comply with the request under 29 U.S.C. § 1132(c), until the documents are produced.

Causes of Action

I. Breach of Plan provisions for benefits in violation of ERISA.

195. Plaintiffs incorporate herein the preceding paragraphs.

196. Victory (and the Plaintiffs) has standing to pursue claims under ERISA as an assignee of the BCBS Subscribers’ claims under the BCBS Plans.

197. As the assignee of the BCBS Subscribers under the BCBS Plans, Victory is entitled to reimbursement under the ERISA Plans for the hospital services provided to the BCBS Subscribers at the Victory facilities.

198. All of the Plans require reimbursement of medical expenses incurred by BCBS Subscribers at the rates described in BCBS Plans. Each of the BCBS Entities acted as a fiduciary to its beneficiaries, including Victory as assignee, because they exercised discretion in determining whether plan benefits would be paid, and/or the amounts of plan benefits that would be paid, to those plan beneficiaries. As a fiduciary under ERISA, each of the BCBS Entities is subject to a civil action under § 502(a) of ERISA. Defendants have breached the terms of the BCBS Plans by refusing to make out-of-network reimbursements for charges covered by the BCBS Plans at the applicable rates set forth in the BCBS Plans in violation of ERISA 502(a)(1)(B), 29 U.S.C. § 1132(a)(1)(B). These breaches include, among other things, refusing to pay the usual and customary charges, and/or reasonable and customary rates, or the prevailing fees or recognized charges or such other rates as expressly provided in the BCBS Plans, for medically-necessary procedures and services performed at the Victory facilities for the BCBS Subscribers. Defendants breached the terms of the BCBS Plans by making claims determinations that had no basis in the terms of the plans, without valid evidence or information to substantiate such determinations and in an unreasonable and arbitrary manner. Defendants' failure to reimburse Victory for healthcare services provided to the BCBS Subscribers was unreasonable and arbitrary, and Defendants abused whatever discretion the BCBS Plans may have provided Defendants.

199. Moreover, Defendants' rights under the Master Services Agreements to receive a portion of any "savings" caused Defendants to self-deal by acquiring private benefits in

exchange for paying too little benefits on behalf of the plan beneficiaries. These rights further gave Defendants a powerful incentive to wrongfully deny or underpay benefits that would have otherwise gone to Victory, thereby incentivizing Defendants to abuse their discretion.

200. As a result of, among other acts, Defendants' numerous procedural and substantive violations of ERISA, any appeals are deemed exhausted or excused, and Plaintiffs are entitled to have this Court undertake a *de novo* review of the issues raised herein.

201. Pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 1132(a)(1)(B), Plaintiffs are entitled to recover unpaid/underpaid benefits from Defendants. As a proximate result of the Defendants' wrongful acts, Victory has been damaged in an amount exceeding \$43 million. The attached Schedules 1a and 1b and Exhibits 1-48 state the amount each of the Plaintiffs seek from each of the Defendants for unpaid/underpaid benefits. The aggregate amount is in excess of \$43 million. Plaintiffs are also entitled to declaratory and injunctive relief to enforce the terms of the Plans, as well as attorneys' fees.

II. Denial of full and fair review and claims procedures in violation of ERISA.

202. Plaintiffs incorporate herein the preceding paragraphs.

203. The Defendants function as the "plan administrator" within the meaning of such term under ERISA in cases where they insured a group health plan or when they were designated as a plan administrator for such plans. In all cases, Defendants had the obligation and authority to make final benefit determinations. As an assignee of the BCBS Subscribers' claims, Victory is entitled to receive protection under ERISA, including (a) a "full and fair review" of all claims denied by Defendants; and (b) compliance by Defendants with applicable claims procedure regulations.

204. Although Defendants are obligated to provide a “full and fair review” of denied claims pursuant to ERISA § 503, 29 U.S.C. § 1133 and applicable regulations, including 29 C.F.R. § 2560.503-1 and 29 C.F.R. § 2590.715-2719, Defendants have failed to do so by, among other actions: refusing to provide written notice of benefit determinations within ninety (90) days of claim submission; refusing to provide the specific reason or reasons for the denial of claims; refusing to provide the specific plan provisions relied upon to support their denials; refusing to provide the specific rule, guideline or protocol relied upon in making the decisions to deny claims; refusing to describe any additional material or information necessary to perfect a claim, such as the appropriate diagnosis/treatment code; refusing to notify the relevant parties that they are entitled to have, free of charge, all documents, records and other information relevant to the claims for benefits; and/or refusing to provide a statement describing any voluntary appeals procedure available, or a description of all required information to be given in connection with that procedure. By failing to comply with the ERISA claims procedures regulations, Defendants failed to provide a reasonable claims procedure.

205. Moreover, Defendants’ rights under the Master Services Agreements to receive a portion of any “savings” gave Defendants a strong incentive to provide unfair review and claims procedures in order to maximize Defendants’ own financial gain at Victory’s expense.

206. Because Defendants have failed to comply with the substantive and procedural requirements of ERISA, any administrative remedies are deemed exhausted pursuant to 29 C.F.R. § 2560.503-1(l) and 29 C.F.R. § 2590.715-2719(b)(2)(ii)(F)(1). Exhaustion is also excused because it would be futile to pursue administrative remedies, as Defendants do not acknowledge any basis for their denials and thus offer no meaningful administrative process for challenging their denials.

207. Victory has been harmed by Defendants' failure to provide a full and fair review of appeals submitted under ERISA § 503, 29 U.S.C. § 1133 and by Defendants' failure to disclose information relevant to appeals and to comply with applicable claims procedure regulations. Defendants further violated the applicable claims procedure regulations by engaging in conduct that rendered their claims procedure and appeals process unfair to the BCBS Subscribers and their assignee (i.e. Victory).

208. Plaintiffs are entitled to relief under ERISA § 502(a)(3), 29 U.S.C. § 1132(a)(3), including declaratory and injunctive relief, to remedy Defendants' failures to provide a full and fair review, to disclose information relevant to appeals, and to comply with applicable claims procedure regulations. As a proximate cause of Defendants' failure to comply with 39 U.S.C. § 1133, Plaintiffs have been damaged as set forth herein.

III. Breach of contract, non-ERISA.

209. Plaintiffs incorporate herein the preceding paragraphs.

210. To the extent that some of the BCBS Plans are not employee welfare benefit plans governed by ERISA, they are nonetheless valid and enforceable insurance contracts.

211. As set forth more fully above, all the BCBS Plans require reimbursement of medical expenses incurred by BCBS Subscribers at specified rates. Further, under the terms of the BCBS Plans, BCBS Subscribers are entitled to coverage for the services that they received from Victory.

212. Pursuant to the "Assignment of Benefits" forms executed by BCBS Subscribers, Victory was assigned the right to receive reimbursement under the BCBS Plans for the services that it rendered to the BCBS Subscribers. Pursuant to said assignments, Defendants are contractually obligated to reimburse Victory for these services.

213. Defendants failed to make payments of benefits to Victory in the manner and amounts required under the terms of the BCBS Plans.

214. As the result of Defendants' failures to comply with the terms of the BCBS Plans, Victory, as assignee, has suffered damages and lost benefits, for which Plaintiffs are entitled to damages from Defendants, including unpaid benefits, restitution, interest, and other contractual damages sustained by Victory.

215. As a result of Defendants' breaches of contract, Plaintiffs have incurred attorneys' fees and costs, which it is entitled to recover against Defendants.

IV. Breach of duty of good faith and fair dealing, non-ERISA.

216. Plaintiffs incorporate herein the preceding paragraphs.

217. As set forth more fully above, with respect to the BCBS Plans that are not employee welfare benefit plans governed by ERISA, they are nonetheless valid and enforceable insurance contracts. As such, the BCBS Plans contain an implied duty of good faith and fair dealing.

218. Defendants, as the obligors under the BCBS Plans, owed the BCBS Subscribers a duty of good faith and fair dealing with respect to said BCBS Plans.

219. As set forth more fully above, the BCBS Subscribers received health care services at Victory and executed "Assignment of Benefit" forms, among other documents, in which they assigned to Victory their right to benefits under the BCBS Plans for the services that Victory provided to the BCBS Subscribers.

220. By virtue of these assignments, Defendants also owe this duty of good faith and fair dealing to Victory.

221. Defendants breached their duty of good faith and fair dealing owed to BCBS Subscribers and Victory, as assignee of rights and benefits under the BCBS Plans, in a number of ways, described more fully above.

222. Without limitation, Defendant's breaches include, but are not limited to, the following:

- i. Defendants' inadequate reimbursement to Victory relative to Victory's charges for the health care services Victory provided to the BCBS Subscribers, when Defendants' liability for those amounts was reasonably clear;
- ii. Defendants' failures to provide Victory with adequate written explanations for the failure to reimburse all or a portion of Victory's claims for the services provided to BCBS Subscribers;
- iii. Defendants' failures to reimburse Victory's charges for the health care services provided to the BCBS Subscribers, and their failures to provide adequate written explanations for the failure to pay all or a portion of such claims, within the statutorily prescribed time frames;
- iv. Defendants' arbitrary methodology for determining whether and the amount to reimburse Victory for the services Victory provided to BCBS Subscribers;
- v. Defendants' patently inadequate explanations for their under-reimbursements to Victory; and
- vi. Defendants' accepting additional compensation in exchange for creating "savings" by wrongfully denying or underpaying benefits that otherwise should have gone to Victory.

223. Defendants' conduct in derogation of their duty of good faith and fair dealing under the BCBS Plans has deprived Victory of its reasonable expectations and benefits as assignee of benefits under the BCBS Plans, and Plaintiffs sue for such amounts.

V. Breach of fiduciary duty.

224. Plaintiffs incorporate herein the preceding paragraphs.

225. At all relevant times, Defendants were the insurer, plan administrator, claim administrator, fiduciary, relevant party-in-interest, and/or the obligor for the BCBS Plans. As such, Defendants owed and still owe the BCBS Subscribers fiduciary duties under the BCBS Plans.

226. As set forth more fully above, BCBS Subscribers have received health care services at Victory and executed “Assignment of Benefits” forms, among other documents, in which they assigned to Victory their rights to benefits under the BCBS Plans for the services that Victory provided to the BCBS Subscribers and any claim they may have for breach of fiduciary duty.

227. By virtue of these assignments, Defendants also owed and owe this fiduciary duty to Victory.

228. Defendants breached their fiduciary duties owed to Victory in a number of ways, described more fully above. For example, each of the BCBS Entities breached its duties to Victory as assignee by not paying and underpaying claims not in accordance with the terms of the applicable plans, and doing so in an arbitrary fashion. Specifically, each of the BCBS Entities acted as a fiduciary to Victory as assignee because they exercised discretion in determining whether plan benefits would be paid, and if so, at what amount. The exercise of discretion in such determinations of plan benefits is an inherently fiduciary function that must be carried out in accordance with the terms of the applicable plans, not in a manner to maximize the interests of the BCBS Entities.

229. By engaging in such conduct described above, each of the BCBS Entities failed to act with the care, skill, prudence and diligence that a prudent plan administrator would use in the conduct of an enterprise of like character or to act in accordance with the documents and

instruments governing the applicable plans. ERISA §§ 404(a)(1)(B) and (D), 29 U.S.C. §§ 1104(a)(1)(B) and (D).

230. As a fiduciary of group health plans under ERISA, each of the BCBS Entities owes beneficiaries a duty of loyalty, defined as an obligation to make decisions in the interest of beneficiaries, and to avoid self-dealing or financial arrangements that benefit the fiduciary at the expense of the beneficiaries. Each of the BCBS Entities violated its fiduciary duty of loyalty by, among other things, determining whether plan benefits would be paid, and/or determining the amounts of plan benefits that would be paid, to those plan beneficiaries based on maximizing benefits to itself rather than making determinations under the terms of the applicable plans. In addition, each of the BCBS Entities made unilateral and unauthorized offsets across BCBS Plans to the detriment of the BCBS Subscribers and Victory, as an assignee.

231. Moreover, Defendants engaged in self-dealing and breached their duty of loyalty when they accepted additional compensation for creating “savings” by wrongfully denying or underpaying benefits that should have otherwise gone to Victory.

232. Victory is entitled to relief for each Defendants’ violation of its fiduciary duties under ERISA § 502(a)(3), 29 U.S.C. § 1132(a)(3), including restitution, injunctive and declaratory relief, and its removal as a breaching fiduciary.

233. As the result of Defendants’ violations of their fiduciary duties to Victory, Victory has suffered substantial damages and Plaintiffs now sue for all such amounts.

VI. Promissory estoppel.

234. Plaintiffs incorporate herein the preceding paragraphs.

235. Defendants represented to Victory that the medical treatment sought by the BCBS Subscribers at Victory was a covered procedure under the BCBS Plans and that the fees associated with that treatment were covered charges under the BCBS Plans. Before scheduling non-emergency procedures for BCBS Subscribers, Victory contacted a representative for the applicable BCBS Entity to confirm coverage and to obtain specific coverage details for the BCBS Subscribers' plan. Based on Defendants' statements that the patients seeking medical care and treatment had active coverage and benefits, Victory reasonably understood that some payment would be forthcoming for the hospital services provided at Victory related to these procedures. In many cases, Defendants would provide Victory the basis upon which it would determine the allowed amount; and often the Defendants would provide a basis that was more advantageous to Victory than the actual terms contained in the applicable plan for determining the allowed amount. By confirming coverage in this manner, Defendants made a clear and definite promise to pay Victory for each of the services provided in accordance with the allowed amount promised.

236. Victory provided hospital services to those BCBS Subscribers in reliance on Defendants' statements regarding coverage and benefits. In the absence of Defendants' statements that they would make remuneration for the fees associated with this treatment, Victory would not have provided the hospital services. This reliance was foreseeable as Defendants' representations were made in the context of telephone calls from Victory's billing agents to verify and pre-certify coverage prior to the hospital services being provided, and there was no ability for Victory to learn, separate and apart from Defendants' representations, whether Defendants considered the fees related to these hospital services to be covered charges under the BCBS Plans.

237. In such instances, Victory has a separate cause of action for promissory estoppel to receive the difference between the level of benefits that were promised by the Defendants' representatives and the level of reimbursement actually paid. See Schedule 2 and Exhibits 1-48.

238. As a result of Victory's reliance on Defendants' statements, Victory has suffered and continues to suffer injury, including money damages, and injustice can only be avoided by Defendants honoring their previous promises. These unambiguous promises constitute obligations Defendants owe to Victory independent of the obligations Defendants owe to the BCBS Subscribers under the applicable plans.

VII. Negligent misrepresentation.

239. Plaintiffs incorporate the preceding paragraphs.

240. On a number of occasions, Defendants represented to Victory that certain BCBS Subscribers had benefits under the BCBS Plans; that there were no applicable exclusions; and that the relevant medical services were pre-certified and in some cases pre-authorized.

241. In addition, on many occasions, Defendants would provide to Victory the basis under which the BCBS Plan at issue determined out-of-network benefits when the BCBS Plan actually provided for such benefits to be determined in a manner contrary to what was represented to Victory. With respect to approximately 777 claims, the BCBS Entities' representatives verified to Victory and negligently misrepresented that Victory's healthcare services would be reimbursed at usual and customary charges or reasonable and customary rates. Based upon these representations, Victory provided services to the BCBS Subscribers. In such cases, Victory has a separate cause of action for negligent misrepresentation to recover

the difference between the level of benefits that were promised by Defendants' representatives and the level of reimbursements actually paid.

242. Victory relied on each of these representations and provided medical services to the BCBS Subscribers. The representations and omissions made by the Defendants were (i) made in the course of their business or in connection with a transaction in which they had a pecuniary interest, (ii) false information provided for Victory's guidance and, (iii) made without the exercise of reasonable care or competence in obtaining and/or communicating the information. Victory detrimentally and reasonably relied upon the representations from Defendants and/or their authorized agents of the BCBS Subscribers' precertification and that Victory would be compensated for its healthcare claim as verified/represented under the BCBS Plan when submitted. These acts and omissions of the Defendants constitute negligently false representations. Because of its reliance on Defendants negligently false representations, Victory has been directly and proximately injured in the sum of at least \$31.5 million in the aggregate. If Victory had known that the Defendants' representations were false, Victory would not have agreed to provide the services to BCBS Subscribers. The claims covered by this cause of action are shown on the attached Schedule 2 and Exhibits 1-48.

VIII. Insurance Code violations.

243. Victory incorporates and re-alleges the allegations set forth above.

i. Overview of claims.

244. It is common practice and customary in the health care industry for health insurance companies, health plans, PPOs, etc., to issue insurance cards which have printed thereon pertinent contact information for the insurance verification agents of insurance companies to verify insurance coverage and benefit levels to hospitals. Using these insurance

cards, hospitals call insurance verification agents to verify the following important information:

- to confirm that an individual has benefits under a health plan/insurance policy;
- to discover what coverage and level of benefits are available to an individual; and
- to discover where the hospital should submit its claim for payment, if the hospital makes the financial decision to accept that particular coverage and level of benefits and provides the care in question to that individual/prospective patient.

245. Hospitals have no other means of verifying coverage and benefits for a prospective patient other than calling an insurance verification agent. Therefore, it is pivotal that the insurance verification agents hired by an insurance company or plan are well qualified, well trained, and well supervised individuals, who are capable of consistently communicating ***clearly*** and ***accurately*** all of the pertinent coverage and benefit information to the hospitals. It is well known in the industry that hospitals must be able to rely upon the coverage and benefit information provided by the insurance verification agents in making the very important financial decision of whether to provide expensive healthcare services to a prospective patient. If the information provided by an insurance verification agent to the hospitals is ***inaccurate*** or ***incomplete***, the hospitals can be severely damaged financially. For decades Texas courts have taken judicial notice of these commercial realities, customs, and routine practices. *See Hermann Hospital v. National Standard Ins.*, 776 S.W.2d 249, 254 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1989, no writ) (holding that hospitals can sue to recover the hospital's damages proximately caused by insurance companies' misrepresentations about the health coverage and benefits available to hospitals for their treatment of patients).

246. Defendants pre-certified the BCBS Subscribers' benefits under the BCBS Plans and certified that the medical services were medically necessary; no exclusions applied; the benefit levels covered the amount of the projected healthcare costs; and that Victory would be compensated for its services. However, the insurance verification agents of the Defendants provided *inaccurate, incomplete* and *untimely information* to Victory. In addition, in many cases Defendants represented to Victory that the allowed amount of benefits would be calculated on the basis of usual and customary charges or reasonable and customary rates when, in fact, the BCBS Plan at issue provided a wholly different manner in which to determine the benefits. These acts and failures to act constitute multiple violations of the Texas Insurance Code for which the Defendants are liable.

247. Victory, both directly and as assignee and successor of the BCBS Subscribers, brings this cause of action for injuries caused by the Defendants acts in violation of Tex. Ins. Code §§ 541.051 and 541.060.

ii. Violations of the Texas Insurance Code.

248. Plaintiffs' cause of action arises out of the following violations of the Texas Insurance Code:

A. Texas Insurance Code, § 541.051, as follows:

make, issue, or circulate or cause to be made, issued or circulated, an estimate, illustration, circular or statement misrepresenting with respect to a policy issued or to be issued the terms of the policy, benefits or advantages promised by the policy.

B. Texas Insurance Code, § 541.060, as follows:

(a) and (b): It is an unfair method of competition or an unfair or deceptive act or practice in the business of insurance to misrepresent to a claimant a material fact or policy provision relating to coverage at issue.

249. Victory has suffered actual damages as a result of these violations of the Texas Insurance Code in a sum of at least \$31.5 million, for which Victory sues the Defendants. See Schedule 2 and Exhibits 1-48.

250. Defendants knowingly committed each of the foregoing acts with actual knowledge of the falsity, unfairness, or deception of the foregoing acts and practices in violation of the Texas Insurance Code.

251. Victory would show that as the Defendants' conduct was committed "knowingly," Victory is entitled to three (3) times the actual damages as provided under Texas Insurance Code § 541.152, plus reasonable attorney's fees, and costs of suit, all for which amount Plaintiffs hereby seek relief.

252. Defendants' conduct as alleged above has made it necessary for Plaintiffs to employ the undersigned attorney to represent it in this lawsuit, thus entitling Plaintiffs to recover its reasonable and necessary attorney's fees in this action under Tex. Ins. Code § 541.152(a)(1) for which amount Plaintiffs hereby seek relief.

253. Plaintiffs would show that all conditions precedent have been performed, excused, or otherwise satisfied. Plaintiffs would further show that any technical notice requirement, if any existed, should be deemed waived and further excused since imposing such would cause an extreme hardship and such technical requirement is not an essential part of the contract.

254. Additionally, if declaratory relief becomes necessary, Plaintiffs request that it be awarded its costs and reasonable and necessary attorney's fees on its behalf incurred pursuant to Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 37.009.

IX. Unjust enrichment, and money had and received.

255. Plaintiffs incorporate herein the preceding paragraphs.

256. Plaintiffs have conferred upon Defendants the benefit of providing treatment to BCBS Subscribers. Plaintiffs have provided services to Defendants, including by discharging Defendants' healthcare obligations to their plans' insureds.

257. By underpaying or not paying Plaintiffs for the treatment that Plaintiffs provided to BCBS Subscribers, Defendants have been unjustly enriched to the extent that Defendants received and/or retained any portion of those "savings" of benefits that should have otherwise been paid to Victory

258. As the result of Defendants' unlawful, unjust, and wrongful acts, Victory suffered and continues to suffer damages, and it is owed restitution from Defendants, and Plaintiffs now sue for all such amounts.

X. ERISA penalties and exemplary damages.

259. Victory incorporates and re-alleges the allegations set forth above.

260. Each of the BCBS Entities' failure to comply with the requests for plan information pursuant to 29 U.S.C. § 1132(c)(1) as described above subjects it to civil penalties in the amount of \$100 per claim per day for such failure and refusal to provide the requested documents, as well as any further relief the Court deems proper. As such, Victory is entitled to at least the requested documents and to the \$100 per claim per day civil penalty and any other relief found appropriate by this Court.

261. As described above, the BCBS Entities' actions and omissions regarding the payment of Victory's valid claims was a direct and proximate cause of its bankruptcy. The BCBS Entities' willful, intentional, and wrongful acts were committed with malice, gross

negligence, and/or fraud, justifying the imposition of punitive and exemplary damages under at least Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code § 41.003, in an amount within of the jurisdictional limits of the Court.

XI. Attorneys' fees.

262. Victory incorporates and re-alleges the allegations set forth above.

263. Pursuant to ERISA (29 U.S.C. § 1132(g)), Tex. Bus. & Comm. Code §§ 38.001, et seq., the Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code, and Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(c), Victory is entitled to an award of attorneys' fees.

Conditions Precedent

264. All conditions precedent to Plaintiffs' recovery and claims have been performed or have occurred.

Jury Demand

265. Plaintiffs demand a jury trial for all causes of action for which they have a right to a jury trial.

Conclusion & Prayer

Wherefore, Plaintiffs demand judgment in its favor against Defendants as follows:

- i. Declaring that Defendants have breached the terms of the BCBS Plans with regard to out-of-network benefits and awarding damages for unpaid out-of-network benefits for the amounts set forth on Schedules 1a and 1b and Exhibits 1-48 attached hereto, as well as awarding injunctive and declaratory relief to prevent Defendants' continuing actions detailed herein that are unauthorized by the BCBS Plans;
- ii. Declaring that Defendants failed to provide a "full and fair review" under § 503 of ERISA, 29 U.S.C. § 1133, and applicable claims procedure regulations, and that "deemed exhaustion" under such regulations is in effect as a result of Defendants' actions, as well as awarding injunctive, declaratory and other equitable relief to ensure compliance with ERISA and its claims procedure regulations;
- iii. Awarding damages based on Defendants' breach of contract with

respect to claims covered under BCBS Plans not governed by ERISA;

- iv. Awarding damages based on Defendants' misrepresentations and nondisclosures regarding the existence of benefits for hospital services based on promissory estoppel;
- v. Awarding damages based on the promises Defendants made to Victory regarding the method upon which Victory's reimbursements would be determined with respect to those claims identified on Schedule 2 and Exhibits 1-48 hereto;
- vi. Awarding damages based on Defendants' negligent misrepresentations regarding the method upon which Victory's reimbursements would be calculated with respect to those claims identified on Schedule 2 and Exhibits 1-48 attached hereto;
- vii. Awarding damages based on Defendants' violations of the Texas Insurance Code, including treble damages for knowing violations;
- viii. Awarding lost profits, contractual damages, and compensatory damages in such amounts as the evidence at trial shall show;
- ix. Awarding exemplary damages for Defendants' intentional and tortious conduct in such amounts as will be shown;
- x. Awarding restitution for reimbursements improperly withheld, set off, or recouped by Defendants;
- xi. Declaring that Defendants have violated the terms of the relevant plans and/or policies of insurance covering the BCBS Subscribers;
- xii. Requiring Defendants to make full payment on all previously denied charges relating to the BCBS Subscribers;
- xiii. Requiring Defendants to pay Victory the benefit amounts as required under the BCBS Plans;
- xiv. Awarding penalties in the amount of \$100 per day per claim for failure to provide required and requested documents;
- xv. Awarding damages/restitution for "savings" taken from benefits that would have otherwise gone to Victory;
- xvi. Awarding reasonable attorneys' fees, as provided by common law, federal or state statute, or equity, including Chapter 38.001 *et seq.* of the Texas Civil Practice and Remedies Code; § 502(g) of ERISA, 29 U.S.C. § 1132(g); and the Texas Insurance Code;

- xvii. Awarding costs of suit;
- xviii. Awarding pre-judgment and post-judgment interest as provided by common law, federal or state statute or rule, or equity; and
- xix. Awarding all other relief to which Plaintiffs are entitled.

Respectfully submitted,

MEADE & NEESE LLP

/s/ Andrew K. Meade

Andrew K. Meade
Texas Bar No. 24032854
ameade@meadeneese.com
2118 Smith Street
Houston, Texas 77002
Phone: (713) 355-1200

HAWASH CICACK & GASTON LLP

Walter J. Cicack
Texas Bar No. 04250535
wcicack@hcglp.com
Jeremy M. Masten
Texas Bar No. 24083454
jmasten@hcglp.com
(713) 658-9001 - phone
(713) 658-9011 - fax

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

SCHEDULE 1A

	CLAIM BILLED AMOUNT	EXPECTED REIMBURSM'T	CALCULATED AMOUNT DUE	TTL INSURANCE PAYMENT	ESTIMATED PATIENT RESPONS.	# OF ACCTS
BEAUMONT	\$ 13,248,709.94	\$ 6,485,113.44	\$ 4,694,045.10	\$ 1,095,711.04	\$ 695,357.30	336
ANTHEM BLUE CROSS LIFE AND HEALTH INS. CO., A.K.A. BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF CALIFORNIA	\$ 611,397.74	\$ 291,744.34	\$ 211,391.69	\$ 56,699.49	\$ 23,653.16	18
ANTHEM HEALTH PLANS OF KENTUCKY, INC.	\$ 10,066.77	\$ 3,020.03	\$ 3,020.03	\$ -	\$ -	1
ANTHEM HEALTH PLANS OF VIRGINIA, INC.	\$ 557,523.73	\$ 236,788.68	\$ 163,074.67	\$ 49,765.94	\$ 23,948.07	11
ANTHEM HEALTH PLANS, INC. D/B/A ANTHEM BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD CONNECTICUT	\$ 29,811.66	\$ 15,888.78	\$ 12,031.90	\$ 1,431.18	\$ 2,425.70	2
ANTHEM INS. COMPANIES, INC. D/B/A BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF INDIANA	\$ 958,599.51	\$ 864,524.18	\$ 645,161.22	\$ 124,721.99	\$ 94,640.97	21
ARKANSAS BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD	\$ 8,198.94	\$ 2,459.68	\$ 1,557.80	\$ -	\$ 901.88	1
BCBSM, INC. D/B/A BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF MINNESOTA	\$ 583,708.15	\$ 281,702.27	\$ 219,421.59	\$ 46,778.51	\$ 15,502.17	7
BLUE CROSS & BLUE SHIELD OF MISSISSIPPI, A MUTUAL INS. CO.	\$ 34,237.41	\$ 10,271.22	\$ 6,288.43	\$ 1,586.17	\$ 2,396.62	1
BLUE CROSS & BLUE SHIELD OF RHODE ISLAND	\$ 375.00	\$ 112.50	\$ 93.75	\$ -	\$ 18.75	1
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF ALABAMA	\$ 897,519.32	\$ 405,656.73	\$ 305,420.45	\$ 61,590.15	\$ 38,646.12	27
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF FLORIDA, INC.	\$ 72,950.81	\$ 57,052.56	\$ 48,367.50	\$ 6,646.72	\$ 2,038.34	8

BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF GEORGIA, INC.	\$ 897,003.88	\$ 475,759.03	\$ 302,228.33	\$ 108,985.90	\$ 64,544.80	34
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF MASSACHUSETTS	\$ 146,890.31	\$ 96,017.16	\$ 84,647.58	\$ 3,675.76	\$ 7,693.82	6
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF NEBRASKA	\$ 54,020.98	\$ 39,829.42	\$ 36,515.73	\$ 1,288.10	\$ 2,025.59	3
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF NORTH CAROLINA	\$ 183,312.43	\$ 152,544.58	\$ 131,941.93	\$ 9,212.22	\$ 11,390.43	5
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF SOUTH CAROLINA	\$ 526,409.09	\$ 156,688.06	\$ 116,960.29	\$ 14,297.19	\$ 25,430.58	9
BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF MICHIGAN	\$ 4,339.23	\$ 1,301.77	\$ 601.65	\$ 483.16	\$ 216.96	1
BLUE CROSS OF CALIFORNIA D/B/A ANTHEM BLUE CROSS	\$ 4,888.32	\$ 1,466.50	\$ 1,222.08	\$ -	\$ 244.42	2
BLUEADVANTAGE ADMINISTRATORS OF ARKANSAS	\$ 186,739.30	\$ 56,021.79	\$ 17,713.87	\$ 18,789.61	\$ 19,518.31	6
BLUECROSS BLUESHIELD OF TENNESSEE, INC.	\$ 1,539,796.50	\$ 862,766.83	\$ 640,572.38	\$ 151,341.97	\$ 70,852.49	30
CAPITAL BLUECROSS, A.K.A. CAPITAL BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD AND CAPITAL HOSPITAL SERVICE	\$ 196,001.76	\$ 108,974.41	\$ 85,020.68	\$ 21,923.87	\$ 2,029.86	4
COMMUNITY INS. CO., D/B/A ANTHEM BLUE CROSS OF OHIO AND/OR BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF OHIO	\$ 975,892.38	\$ 407,573.13	\$ 238,008.14	\$ 74,840.69	\$ 94,724.30	14
EMPIRE HEALTHCHOICE ASSURANCE, INC. D/B/A EMPIRE BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD AND AS BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF NEW YORK	\$ 83,986.23	\$ 25,195.87	\$ 9,811.95	\$ 10,344.75	\$ 5,039.17	1
HEALTHNOW NEW YORK INC. D/B/A	\$ 44,112.29	\$ 13,233.69	\$ 9,642.69	\$ 2,237.08	\$ 1,353.92	4

BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF WESTERN NEW YORK, INC.						
HIGHMARK, INC. D/B/A HIGHMARK BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD D/B/A HIGHMARK BLUE SHIELD	\$ 1,284,220.84	\$ 613,292.49	\$ 463,180.15	\$ 77,756.74	\$ 72,355.60	39
HORIZON BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF NEW JERSEY	\$ 827.00	\$ 248.10	\$ 206.75	\$ -	\$ 41.35	1
INDEPENDENCE HEALTH GROUP, INC., INCLUDING ITS SUBSIDIARIES	\$ 434,238.70	\$ 109,161.41	\$ 26,237.49	\$ 65,434.03	\$ 17,489.90	6
LIFETIME HEALTHCARE, INC. D/B/A EXCELLUS BLUECROSS BLUESHIELD	\$ 26,571.19	\$ 7,971.36	\$ 3,359.54	\$ 3,283.26	\$ 1,328.56	1
LOUISIANA HEALTH SERVICE & INDEMNITY CO.	\$ 2,346,443.42	\$ 880,591.42	\$ 668,975.01	\$ 146,018.03	\$ 65,598.38	51
PREMERA BLUE CROSS AND PREMERA BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF ALASKA	\$ 9,111.09	\$ 2,733.33	\$ 1,601.08	\$ 676.69	\$ 455.55	4
REGENCE BLUECROSS BLUESHIELD OF OREGON	\$ 100,728.52	\$ 30,218.56	\$ 23,463.77	\$ 4,404.21	\$ 2,350.58	2
REGENCE BLUECROSS BLUESHIELD OF UTAH	\$ 3,243.24	\$ 972.97	\$ 810.81	\$ -	\$ 162.16	2
RIGHTCHOICE MANAGED CARE, INC. D/B/A ANTHEM BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD MISSOURI	\$ 245,773.19	\$ 188,391.41	\$ 149,581.06	\$ 22,416.59	\$ 16,393.76	5
ROCKY MOUNTAIN HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL SERVICE, INC. D/B/A ANTHEM BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF COLORADO	\$ 175,770.90	\$ 80,739.16	\$ 63,149.29	\$ 7,932.08	\$ 9,657.79	7

WELLMARK, INC. D/B/A WELLMARK BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF IOWA D/B/A BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF IOWA	\$ 14,000.11	\$ 4,200.03	\$ 2,763.83	\$ 1,148.96	\$ 287.24	1
CRAIG RANCH	\$ 10,275,738.85	\$ 6,047,972.31	\$ 4,309,977.83	\$ 1,187,828.96	\$ 550,165.52	224
ANTHEM BLUE CROSS LIFE AND HEALTH INS. CO., A.K.A BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF CALIFORNIA	\$ 1,742,620.76	\$ 1,048,934.25	\$ 686,425.92	\$ 278,492.26	\$ 84,016.07	33
ANTHEM HEALTH PLANS OF VIRGINIA, INC.	\$ 85,857.10	\$ 49,473.10	\$ 33,985.41	\$ 7,653.95	\$ 7,833.74	7
ANTHEM HEALTH PLANS, INC. D/B/A ANTHEM BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD CONNECTICUT	\$ 17,836.24	\$ 17,836.24	\$ 9,459.99	\$ 5,080.30	\$ 3,295.95	1
ANTHEM INS. COMPANIES, INC. D/B/A BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF INDIANA	\$ 510,759.31	\$ 388,834.04	\$ 250,396.14	\$ 80,866.09	\$ 57,571.81	13
ARKANSAS BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD	\$ 60,681.90	\$ 18,204.57	\$ 8,817.53	\$ 6,105.38	\$ 3,281.66	1
BCBSM, INC. D/B/A BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF MINNESOTA	\$ 894,226.66	\$ 280,183.77	\$ 185,206.44	\$ 65,845.55	\$ 29,131.79	14
BLUE CROSS & BLUE SHIELD OF MISSISSIPPI, A MUTUAL INS. CO.	\$ 52,165.64	\$ 29,212.76	\$ 21,217.92	\$ 7,644.95	\$ 349.89	1
BLUE CROSS & BLUE SHIELD OF RHODE ISLAND	\$ 15,161.95	\$ 15,161.95	\$ 13,940.54	\$ 577.14	\$ 644.27	1
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD HEALTHCARE PLAN OF GEORGIA	\$ 178,382.31	\$ 63,133.30	\$ 40,956.14	\$ 15,778.10	\$ 6,399.06	3

BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF ALABAMA	\$ 1,291,222.00	\$ 777,031.81	\$ 545,213.89	\$ 173,101.76	\$ 58,716.16	25
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF FLORIDA, INC.	\$ 100,599.68	\$ 62,399.18	\$ 56,135.88	\$ 2,771.26	\$ 3,492.04	3
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF GEORGIA, INC.	\$ 224,056.67	\$ 178,896.34	\$ 132,298.39	\$ 29,041.16	\$ 17,556.79	6
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF KANSAS CITY	\$ 93,097.04	\$ 82,541.04	\$ 71,901.53	\$ 7,235.73	\$ 3,403.78	3
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF MASSACHUSETTS, INC, D.B.A. BLUE BENEFIT ADMINIS.	\$ 458,727.10	\$ 358,150.98	\$ 327,383.55	\$ 20,433.29	\$ 10,334.15	12
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF NEBRASKA	\$ 287,331.11	\$ 101,514.96	\$ 62,993.72	\$ 28,948.16	\$ 9,573.08	4
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF NORTH CAROLINA	\$ 399,150.01	\$ 253,528.89	\$ 177,369.41	\$ 41,131.76	\$ 35,027.72	8
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF SOUTH CAROLINA	\$ 133,179.90	\$ 65,428.35	\$ 44,555.90	\$ 8,921.82	\$ 11,950.63	4
BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF MICHIGAN	\$ 41,562.15	\$ 12,468.65	\$ 10,038.86	\$ -	\$ 2,429.79	2
BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF WISCONSIN D/B/A ANTHEM BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF WISCONSIN	\$ 222,108.35	\$ 206,647.48	\$ 159,145.94	\$ 42,960.49	\$ 4,541.05	3
BLUEADVANTAGE ADMINISTRATORS OF ARKANSAS	\$ 599,633.79	\$ 256,256.22	\$ 158,414.11	\$ 50,451.23	\$ 47,390.88	12
BLUECROSS BLUESHIELD OF TENNESSEE, INC.	\$ 386,578.30	\$ 214,511.55	\$ 164,349.14	\$ 28,583.15	\$ 21,579.26	6
CALIFORNIA PHYSICIANS' SERVICE, PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED AS BLUE SHIELD OF CALIFORNIA LIFE & HEALTH INS. CO. D/B/A BLUE SHIELD OF CALIFORNIA	\$ 206,889.34	\$ 144,659.14	\$ 131,935.76	\$ 10,946.88	\$ 1,776.50	5

CAPITAL BLUECROSS A.K.A. CAPITAL BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD AND CAPITAL HOSPITAL SERVICE	\$ 19,661.82	\$ 19,661.82	\$ 18,015.77	\$ 146.05	\$ 1,500.00	1
COMMUNITY INS. CO. D/B/A ANTHEM BLUE CROSS OF OHIO	\$ 504,724.35	\$ 319,942.49	\$ 221,453.10	\$ 68,662.41	\$ 29,826.98	12
HEALTHNOW NEW YORK INC. D/B/A BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF WESTERN NEW YORK, INC.	\$ 88,549.24	\$ 88,549.24	\$ 64,235.94	\$ 17,122.47	\$ 7,190.83	4
HIGHMARK, INC. D/B/A HIGHMARK BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD D/B/A HIGHMARK BLUE SHIELD	\$ 672,805.09	\$ 259,386.06	\$ 166,062.53	\$ 53,507.74	\$ 39,815.78	9
HORIZON BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF NEW JERSEY	\$ 398,705.85	\$ 374,384.23	\$ 270,375.64	\$ 93,637.77	\$ 10,370.82	7
INDEPENDENCE HEALTH GROUP, INC., INCLUDING ITS SUBSIDIARIES	\$ 93,435.11	\$ 41,847.52	\$ 36,137.41	\$ 3,243.97	\$ 2,466.14	4
LOUISIANA HEALTH SERVICE & INDEMNITY CO. D/B/A BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF LOUISIANA	\$ 214,082.99	\$ 84,319.86	\$ 61,318.67	\$ 11,284.09	\$ 11,717.11	6
PREMERA BLUE CROSS AND PREMERA BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF ALASKA	\$ 100,921.73	\$ 94,388.60	\$ 81,265.43	\$ 6,276.15	\$ 6,847.02	4
ROCKY MOUNTAIN HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL SERVICE, INC. D/B/A ANTHEM BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF COLORADO	\$ 181,025.36	\$ 140,483.92	\$ 98,971.24	\$ 21,377.90	\$ 20,134.78	10

EAST HOUSTON	\$ 2,393,033.91	\$ 1,248,886.50	\$ 939,536.85	\$ 185,068.41	\$ 24,281.24	105
ANTHEM BLUE CROSS LIFE AND HEALTH INS. CO., A.K.A. BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF CALIFORNIA	\$ 148,157.04	\$ 50,469.24	\$ 40,812.12	\$ 4,559.89	\$ 5,097.23	4
ANTHEM HEALTH PLANS OF KENTUCKY, INC.	\$ 28,738.14	\$ 28,738.14	\$ 21,541.13	\$ 1,310.10	\$ 5,886.91	1
ANTHEM HEALTH PLANS OF VIRGINIA, INC. D/B/A BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF VIRGINIA	\$ 27,584.97	\$ 10,778.80	\$ 7,745.98	\$ 1,172.60	\$ 1,860.23	2
ANTHEM INS. CO., INC. ALSO D/B/A BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF INDIANA	\$ 114,685.58	\$ 56,449.74	\$ 38,316.71	\$ 6,867.35	\$ 11,265.67	6
BCBSM, INC. D/B/A BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF MINNESOTA	\$ 62,084.95	\$ 22,563.15	\$ 19,836.37	\$ 1,660.73	\$ 1,066.05	4
BLUE CROSS & BLUE SHIELD OF MISSISSIPPI, A MUTUAL INS. CO.	\$ 71,436.31	\$ 21,430.89	\$ 10,912.63	\$ 10,518.26	\$ -	1
BLUE CROSS & BLUE SHIELD OF RHODE ISLAND	\$ 10,524.15	\$ 3,157.25	\$ 1,693.70	\$ -	\$ 1,463.55	1
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF ALABAMA	\$ 72,980.11	\$ 65,095.46	\$ 56,496.04	\$ 2,289.68	\$ 6,309.74	3
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF FLORIDA, INC.	\$ 68,880.67	\$ 20,664.20	\$ 9,543.51	\$ 7,030.94	\$ 4,089.75	2
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF GEORGIA, INC.	\$ 139,233.39	\$ 107,290.46	\$ 93,086.92	\$ 9,691.81	\$ 4,511.73	4
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF KANSAS CITY	\$ 21,122.93	\$ 13,738.95	\$ 10,625.59	\$ 1,568.05	\$ 1,545.31	2
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF MASSACHUSETTS, INC ALSO DOING BUSINESS AS BLUE BENEFIT ADMINS.	\$ 46,261.03	\$ 46,261.03	\$ 46,261.03	\$ -	\$ -	2
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF NEBRASKA	\$ 67,461.16	\$ 53,585.51	\$ 45,426.13	\$ 4,786.32	\$ 3,373.06	2

BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF MICHIGAN	\$ 50,669.21	\$ 14,157.28	\$ 6,154.91	\$ 6,988.99	\$ 1,013.38	2
BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF WISCONSIN D/B/A ANTHEM BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF WISCONSIN	\$ 27,845.77	\$ 8,353.73	\$ 2,693.28	\$ 2,597.42	\$ 3,063.03	1
BLUEADVANTAGE ADMINISTRATORS OF ARKANSAS	\$ 139,529.08	\$ 73,966.63	\$ 56,937.79	\$ 1,680.64	\$ 15,348.20	7
BLUECROSS BLUESHIELD OF TENNESSEE, INC.	\$ 61,108.55	\$ 33,027.13	\$ 28,767.32	\$ 792.95	\$ 3,466.87	4
CAPITAL BLUECROSS ALSO KNOWN AS CAPITAL BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD AND CAPITAL HOSPITAL SERVICE	\$ 39,302.77	\$ 11,790.83	\$ 5,269.77	\$ 5,735.01	\$ 786.06	1
COMMUNITY INS. CO. D/B/A ANTHEM BLUE CROSS OF OHIO AND/OR BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF OHIO	\$ 133,707.16	\$ 95,086.61	\$ 78,379.26	\$ 11,457.56	\$ 5,249.79	9
GROUP HOSPITALIZATION AND MEDICAL SERVICES, INC. D/B/A CAREFIRST BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD	\$ 39,952.69	\$ 26,196.40	\$ 20,131.05	\$ 4,670.25	\$ 1,395.10	2
HIGHMARK BCBSD, INC. D/B/A HIGHMARK BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD DELAWARE	\$ 4,012.00	\$ 2,246.72	\$ 1,952.84	\$ 35.10	\$ 258.78	1
HIGHMARK, INC. D/B/A HIGHMARK BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD D/B/A HIGHMARK BLUE SHIELD	\$ 207,320.84	\$ 87,187.88	\$ 68,383.44	\$ 7,224.06	\$ 11,580.38	13
HORIZON BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF NEW JERSEY ALSO KNOWN AS BLUE	\$ 11,406.60	\$ 6,387.70	\$ 4,904.92	\$ 739.67	\$ 743.11	1

CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF NEW JERSEY						
LOUISIANA HEALTH SERVICE & INDEMNITY CO. D/B/A BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF LOUISIANA	\$ 633,379.03	\$ 271,289.78	\$ 176,921.03	\$ 68,503.42	\$ 25,865.34	22
PREMERA BLUE CROSS AND PREMERA BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF ALASKA	\$ 36,083.19	\$ 10,824.96	\$ 1,975.18	\$ 7,114.42	\$ 1,735.36	1
REGENCE BLUECROSS BLUESHIELD OF UTAH	\$ 10,569.98	\$ 3,170.99	\$ 2,741.55	\$ 112.34	\$ 317.10	1
RIGHTCHOICE MANAGED CARE, INC. D/B/A ANTHEM BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD MISSOURI	\$ 25,763.06	\$ 25,763.06	\$ 18,718.65	\$ 4,210.47	\$ 2,833.94	1
ROCKY MOUNTAIN HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL SERVICE, INC. D/B/A ANTHEM BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF COLORADO	\$ 68,844.28	\$ 54,824.72	\$ 45,895.82	\$ 5,261.09	\$ 3,667.81	4
WELLMARK, INC. D/B/A WELLMARK BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF IOWA D/B/A BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF IOWA	\$ 24,389.27	\$ 24,389.27	\$ 17,412.19	\$ 6,489.29	\$ 487.79	1
INNOVA / SOUTHCROSS	\$ 25,960,709.89	\$ 13,936,540.12	\$ 10,562,404.75	\$ 2,872,617.45	\$ 501,517.92	197
ANTHEM BLUE CROSS LIFE AND HEALTH INS. CO., A.K.A. BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF CALIFORNIA	\$ 347,893.26	\$ 180,086.47	\$ 137,743.06	\$ 26,029.26	\$ 16,314.15	6

ANTHEM HEALTH PLANS OF KENTUCKY, INC.	\$ 1,289,838.29	\$ 506,745.34	\$ 376,519.26	\$ 123,236.25	\$ 6,989.83	6
ANTHEM HEALTH PLANS OF VIRGINIA, INC. D/B/A BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF VIRGINIA	\$ 953,385.32	\$ 537,921.71	\$ 364,473.90	\$ 163,561.05	\$ 9,886.76	4
ANTHEM INS. COMPANIES, INC. ALSO D/B/A BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF INDIANA	\$ 4,748,497.70	\$ 2,737,243.22	\$ 2,160,371.64	\$ 463,397.23	\$ 113,474.34	37
BCBSM, INC. D/B/A BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF MINNESOTA	\$ 152,430.65	\$ 59,045.98	\$ 35,257.91	\$ 14,551.74	\$ 9,236.33	6
BLUE CROSS & BLUE SHIELD OF RHODE ISLAND	\$ 93,347.47	\$ 38,549.17	\$ 30,681.97	\$ 5,893.85	\$ 1,973.35	2
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF ALABAMA	\$ 118,044.34	\$ 74,245.87	\$ 52,918.80	\$ 14,790.43	\$ 6,536.64	2
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF GEORGIA, INC.	\$ 2,601,057.77	\$ 2,537,193.67	\$ 2,034,365.63	\$ 464,432.73	\$ 38,395.31	9
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF MASSACHUSETTS, INC ALSO DOING BUSINESS AS BLUE BENEFIT ADMINS.	\$ 195,823.92	\$ 69,856.32	\$ 57,989.38	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 1,866.94	3
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF NEBRASKA	\$ 25,618.35	\$ 25,618.35	\$ 14,329.84	\$ 5,573.10	\$ 5,715.41	1
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF NORTH CAROLINA	\$ 285,898.85	\$ 85,769.66	\$ 43,661.54	\$ 26,029.05	\$ 16,079.07	6
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF SOUTH CAROLINA	\$ 544,573.45	\$ 178,443.12	\$ 78,173.41	\$ 62,936.17	\$ 37,333.54	3
BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF KANSAS, INC.	\$ 132,626.81	\$ 39,788.04	\$ 36,943.85	\$ 2,844.19	\$ -	1
BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF MICHIGAN	\$ 373,081.67	\$ 111,924.50	\$ 72,800.68	\$ 30,296.78	\$ 8,827.04	7
BLUEADVANTAGE ADMINISTRATORS OF ARKANSAS	\$ 61,939.09	\$ 18,581.73	\$ 13,356.51	\$ 1,954.51	\$ 3,270.71	4

BLUECROSS BLUESHIELD OF TENNESSEE, INC.	\$ 2,707,615.12	\$ 2,268,850.45	\$ 1,762,829.16	\$ 473,016.84	\$ 33,004.45	10
CALIFORNIA PHYSICIANS' SERVICE, PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED AS BLUE SHIELD OF CALIFORNIA LIFE & HEALTH INSURANCE COMPANY D/B/A BLUE SHIELD OF CALIFORNIA	\$ 280,499.70	\$ 84,149.91	\$ 75,023.38	\$ 7,334.83	\$ 1,791.70	4
CAPITAL BLUECROSS ALSO KNOWN AS CAPITAL BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD AND CAPITAL HOSPITAL SERVICE	\$ 280,328.93	\$ 106,136.98	\$ 44,239.95	\$ 56,194.52	\$ 5,702.50	4
COMMUNITY INS. CO. D/B/A ANTHEM BLUE CROSS OF OHIO AND/OR BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF OHIO	\$ 907,244.36	\$ 394,353.51	\$ 306,430.78	\$ 71,366.75	\$ 16,555.99	9
EMPIRE HEALTHCHOICE ASSURANCE, INC. D/B/A EMPIRE BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD AND AS BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF NEW YORK	\$ 665,187.82	\$ 373,971.70	\$ 329,231.64	\$ 34,563.70	\$ 10,176.36	7
GROUP HOSPITALIZATION AND MEDICAL SERVICES, INC. D/B/A CAREFIRST BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD	\$ 841,832.69	\$ 252,549.81	\$ 183,628.17	\$ 53,157.43	\$ 15,764.21	7
HEALTHNOW NEW YORK INC. D/B/A BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF WESTERN NEW YORK, INC.	\$ 190,833.50	\$ 89,748.53	\$ 56,260.12	\$ 25,185.46	\$ 8,302.94	7
HIGHMARK, INC. D/B/A HIGHMARK BLUE CROSS BLUE	\$ 612,435.52	\$ 281,198.07	\$ 223,154.40	\$ 39,169.73	\$ 18,873.94	10

SHIELD D/B/A HIGHMARK BLUE SHIELD						
HORIZON BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF NEW JERSEY ALSO KNOWN AS BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF NEW JERSEY	\$ 91,494.69	\$ 42,735.21	\$ 42,735.21	\$ -	\$ -	5
INDEPENDENCE HEALTH GROUP, INC., INCLUDING ITS SUBSIDIARIES	\$ 1,582,285.18	\$ 514,315.23	\$ 245,448.86	\$ 255,384.78	\$ 13,481.59	6
LIFETIME HEALTHCARE, INC. D/B/A EXCELLUS BLUECROSS BLUESHIELD	\$ 247,426.86	\$ 74,228.06	\$ 35,920.63	\$ 34,190.16	\$ 4,117.26	5
LOUISIANA HEALTH SERVICE & INDEMNITY COMPANY D/B/A BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF LOUISIANA	\$ 3,943,222.22	\$ 1,378,216.59	\$ 1,123,331.94	\$ 244,636.49	\$ 10,248.16	17
PREMERA BLUE CROSS AND PREMERA BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF ALASKA	\$ 158,132.57	\$ 158,132.57	\$ 80,809.75	\$ 46,393.71	\$ 30,929.11	1
REGENCE BLUESHIELD, ALSO DOING BUSINESS AS REGENCE GROUP ADMINISTRATORS	\$ 685,229.18	\$ 205,568.75	\$ 160,249.62	\$ 27,191.67	\$ 18,127.46	4
ROCKY MOUNTAIN HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL SERVICE, INC. D/B/A ANTHEM BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF COLORADO	\$ 842,884.61	\$ 511,371.61	\$ 383,523.73	\$ 89,305.04	\$ 38,542.84	4
LANDMARK	\$ 19,406,296.43	\$ 11,624,765.84	\$ 9,026,304.93	\$ 2,009,824.48	\$ 588,636.43	169
ANTHEM BLUE CROSS LIFE AND	\$ 447,268.16	\$ 175,394.47	\$ 124,735.73	\$ 35,554.07	\$ 15,104.67	7

HEALTH INS. CO., ALSO KNOWN AS BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF CALIFORNIA						
ANTHEM HEALTH PLANS OF KENTUCKY, INC.	\$ 961,526.86	\$ 764,753.06	\$ 577,437.65	\$ 137,202.63	\$ 50,112.77	8
ANTHEM HEALTH PLANS OF VIRGINIA, INC. D/B/A BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF VIRGINIA	\$ 491,140.05	\$ 491,140.05	\$ 427,516.59	\$ 61,564.25	\$ 2,059.21	2
ANTHEM HEALTH PLANS, INC. D/B/A ANTHEM BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD CONNECTICUT	\$ 41,646.64	\$ 22,489.19	\$ 12,279.87	\$ 5,628.19	\$ 4,581.13	1
ANTHEM INS. COMPANIES, INC. ALSO D/B/A BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF INDIANA	\$ 5,751,818.12	\$ 4,288,405.86	\$ 3,126,660.55	\$ 1,000,319.62	\$ 161,425.69	35
BCBSM, INC. D/B/A BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF MINNESOTA	\$ 1,996,649.52	\$ 604,736.78	\$ 381,833.25	\$ 159,063.67	\$ 63,839.86	9
BLUE CROSS & BLUE SHIELD OF MISSISSIPPI, A MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY	\$ 89,683.14	\$ 26,904.94	\$ 10,589.02	\$ 13,815.92	\$ 2,500.00	1
BLUE CROSS & BLUE SHIELD OF RHODE ISLAND	\$ 49,090.89	\$ 14,727.27	\$ 9,759.54	\$ 3,283.33	\$ 1,684.39	2
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD HEALTHCARE PLAN OF GEORGIA	\$ 39,426.29	\$ 11,827.89	\$ 4,622.18	\$ 2,809.09	\$ 4,396.62	2
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF ALABAMA	\$ 856,903.77	\$ 555,654.00	\$ 473,094.37	\$ 62,079.02	\$ 20,480.61	8
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF FLORIDA, INC.	\$ 146,434.16	\$ 51,863.10	\$ 41,437.71	\$ 3,233.23	\$ 7,192.16	3
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF GEORGIA, INC.	\$ 317,277.89	\$ 165,251.17	\$ 77,964.66	\$ 61,261.33	\$ 26,025.19	7
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF	\$ 220,107.52	\$ 122,152.84	\$ 102,918.85	\$ 16,333.99	\$ 2,900.00	3

MASSACHUSETTS, INC ALSO DOING BUSINESS AS BLUE BENEFIT ADMINS.						
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF NORTH CAROLINA	\$ 435,566.08	\$ 425,654.23	\$ 389,992.53	\$ 20,385.87	\$ 15,275.83	4
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF SOUTH CAROLINA	\$ 77,887.78	\$ 35,018.87	\$ 18,364.85	\$ 6,752.06	\$ 9,901.96	2
BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF MICHIGAN	\$ 39,812.09	\$ 29,520.66	\$ 29,520.66	\$ -	\$ -	2
BLUEADVANTAGE ADMINISTRATORS OF ARKANSAS	\$ 279,768.09	\$ 115,296.80	\$ 74,962.69	\$ 15,481.50	\$ 24,852.61	7
BLUECROSS BLUESHIELD OF TENNESSEE, INC.	\$ 1,926,436.70	\$ 994,590.66	\$ 822,175.20	\$ 96,568.27	\$ 75,847.19	14
CAPITAL BLUECROSS ALSO KNOWN AS CAPITAL BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD AND CAPITAL HOSPITAL SERVICE COMMUNITY INS. CO. D/B/A ANTHEM BLUE CROSS OF OHIO AND/OR BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF OHIO	\$ 124,152.64	\$ 37,245.79	\$ 26,492.14	\$ 6,288.85	\$ 4,464.80	3
EMPIRE HEALTHCHOICE ASSURANCE, INC. D/B/A EMPIRE BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD AND AS BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF NEW YORK	\$ 271,795.21	\$ 167,845.80	\$ 113,980.97	\$ 48,215.65	\$ 5,649.18	3
GROUP HOSPITALIZATION AND MEDICAL SERVICES, INC. D/B/A CAREFIRST BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD	\$ 678,293.80	\$ 203,488.14	\$ 180,978.18	\$ 20,029.70	\$ 2,480.26	5
HEALTHNOW NEW YORK INC. D/B/A BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF	\$ 133,242.21	\$ 102,824.38	\$ 95,093.93	\$ 4,304.46	\$ 3,425.99	4

WESTERN NEW YORK, INC.						
HIGHMARK, INC. D/B/A HIGHMARK BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD D/B/A HIGHMARK BLUE SHIELD	\$ 262,727.01	\$ 96,834.86	\$ 51,531.74	\$ 31,808.79	\$ 13,494.33	9
HORIZON BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF NEW JERSEY ALSO KNOWN AS BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF NEW JERSEY	\$ 139,954.47	\$ 78,374.50	\$ 57,082.32	\$ 16,528.92	\$ 4,763.26	3
INDEPENDENCE HEALTH GROUP, INC., INCLUDING ITS SUBSIDIARIES	\$ 38,944.32	\$ 11,683.30	\$ 8,195.92	\$ 1,540.16	\$ 1,947.22	1
LOUISIANA HEALTH SERVICE & INDEMNITY CO. D/B/A BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF LOUISIANA	\$ 970,498.63	\$ 645,724.92	\$ 578,737.47	\$ 49,445.52	\$ 17,541.93	5
PREMERA BLUE CROSS AND PREMERA BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF ALASKA	\$ 212,105.52	\$ 63,631.66	\$ 51,258.19	\$ 8,901.58	\$ 3,471.89	1
REGENCE BLUECROSS BLUESHIELD OF OREGON	\$ 43,953.63	\$ 13,186.09	\$ 8,481.32	\$ 2,352.43	\$ 2,352.34	1
REGENCE BLUECROSS BLUESHIELD OF UTAH	\$ 162,699.98	\$ 80,664.52	\$ 59,959.81	\$ 20,163.91	\$ 540.80	3
REGENCE BLUESHIELD, ALSO DOING BUSINESS AS REGENCE GROUP ADMINISTRATORS	\$ 10,390.53	\$ 3,117.16	\$ 1,954.20	\$ 643.43	\$ 519.53	2
RIGHTCHOICE MANAGED CARE, INC. D/B/A ANTHEM BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD MISSOURI	\$ 282,399.87	\$ 84,719.96	\$ 67,594.11	\$ 11,477.85	\$ 5,648.00	1
ROCKY MOUNTAIN HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL SERVICE,	\$ 1,644,780.53	\$ 1,053,844.88	\$ 955,406.41	\$ 72,220.69	\$ 26,217.78	9

INC. D/B/A ANTHEM BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF COLORADO						
WELLMARK, INC. D/B/A WELLMARK BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF IOWA D/B/A BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF IOWA	\$ 251,023.21	\$ 75,306.96	\$ 56,138.75	\$ 14,147.75	\$ 5,020.46	1
MID-CITIES	\$ 18,849,097.06	\$ 8,535,302.23	\$ 5,426,724.82	\$ 2,299,855.34	\$ 808,722.07	339
ANTHEM BLUE CROSS LIFE AND HEALTH INSURANCE COMPANY, ALSO KNOWN AS BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF CALIFORNIA	\$ 1,396,253.38	\$ 902,258.53	\$ 635,504.81	\$ 181,505.37	\$ 85,248.35	28
ANTHEM HEALTH PLANS OF KENTUCKY, INC.	\$ 209,766.72	\$ 103,251.86	\$ 62,588.87	\$ 22,969.21	\$ 17,693.78	5
ANTHEM HEALTH PLANS OF VIRGINIA, INC. D/B/A BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF VIRGINIA	\$ 452,228.83	\$ 200,527.91	\$ 83,729.45	\$ 84,276.21	\$ 32,522.25	7
ANTHEM INS. COMPANIES, INC. ALSO D/B/A BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF INDIANA	\$ 1,265,180.71	\$ 891,231.77	\$ 591,824.94	\$ 212,247.54	\$ 87,159.29	34
ARKANSAS BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD	\$ 74,378.97	\$ 47,001.87	\$ 35,928.03	\$ 6,044.36	\$ 5,029.48	2
BCBSM, INC. D/B/A BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF MINNESOTA	\$ 1,161,281.54	\$ 349,251.40	\$ 259,058.84	\$ 83,577.85	\$ 6,614.71	9
BLUE CROSS & BLUE SHIELD OF RHODE ISLAND	\$ 125,223.29	\$ 37,566.99	\$ 23,713.18	\$ 7,455.33	\$ 6,398.48	2
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD	\$ 39,850.95	\$ 39,850.95	\$ 34,724.94	\$ 788.28	\$ 4,337.73	1

HEALTHCARE PLAN OF GEORGIA BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF ALABAMA	\$ 3,158,545.44	\$ 1,344,820.09	\$ 820,784.40	\$ 435,942.25	\$ 88,093.44	31
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF FLORIDA, INC.	\$ 163,962.29	\$ 40,990.57	\$ 17,040.54	\$ 21,536.27	\$ 2,413.76	1
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF GEORGIA, INC.	\$ 639,360.00	\$ 432,297.97	\$ 334,478.59	\$ 62,947.04	\$ 34,872.34	10
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF KANSAS CITY	\$ 343,221.98	\$ 131,528.58	\$ 51,014.07	\$ 62,530.38	\$ 17,984.13	3
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF MASSACHUSETTS, INC ALSO DOING BUSINESS AS BLUE BENEFIT ADMINS.	\$ 379,119.44	\$ 206,302.37	\$ 159,087.98	\$ 40,327.26	\$ 6,887.13	10
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF NEBRASKA	\$ 150,014.70	\$ 45,004.41	\$ 21,743.00	\$ 11,998.70	\$ 11,262.71	9
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF NORTH CAROLINA	\$ 236,742.63	\$ 71,022.79	\$ 16,637.06	\$ 48,367.28	\$ 6,018.45	2
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF SOUTH CAROLINA	\$ 98,032.97	\$ 67,563.45	\$ 51,108.37	\$ 12,130.52	\$ 4,324.57	3
BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF KANSAS, INC.	\$ 157,361.30	\$ 47,208.39	\$ 41,869.45	\$ 3,888.59	\$ 1,450.35	8
BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF MICHIGAN	\$ 314,260.72	\$ 94,278.22	\$ 76,062.87	\$ 15,035.19	\$ 3,180.16	10
BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF WISCONSIN D/B/A ANTHEM BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF WISCONSIN	\$ 70,348.76	\$ 51,752.92	\$ 41,864.82	\$ 6,048.68	\$ 3,839.42	4
BLUE CROSS OF CALIFORNIA D/B/A ANTHEM BLUE CROSS	\$ 168,479.63	\$ 50,543.89	\$ 29,702.38	\$ 13,051.13	\$ 7,790.38	2
BLUE CROSS OF IDAHO CARE PLUS, INC. AND BLUE CROSS OF IDAHO HEALTH SERVICE, INC. D/B/A BLUE CROSS OF IDAHO	\$ 202,973.56	\$ 60,004.18	\$ 36,077.58	\$ 13,936.11	\$ 9,990.49	5

BLUEADVANTAGE ADMINISTRATORS OF ARKANSAS	\$ 430,603.26	\$ 141,156.63	\$ 60,067.69	\$ 33,433.82	\$ 47,655.12	6
BLUECROSS BLUESHIELD OF TENNESSEE, INC.	\$ 920,275.21	\$ 374,240.48	\$ 228,634.10	\$ 94,705.03	\$ 50,901.35	20
CALIFORNIA PHYSICIANS' SERVICE, PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED AS BLUE SHIELD OF CALIFORNIA LIFE & HEALTH INSURANCE COMPANY D/B/A BLUE SHIELD OF CALIFORNIA	\$ 249,011.54	\$ 155,988.18	\$ 152,671.52	\$ 2,110.00	\$ 1,206.66	6
CAPITAL BLUECROSS ALSO KNOWN AS CAPITAL BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD AND CAPITAL HOSPITAL SERVICE COMMUNITY INS. CO. D/B/A ANTHEM BLUE CROSS OF OHIO AND/OR BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF OHIO	\$ 758.83	\$ 227.65	\$ 189.71	\$ -	\$ 37.94	1
EMPIRE HEALTHCHOICE ASSURANCE, INC. D/B/A EMPIRE BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD AND AS BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF NEW YORK	\$ 892,302.34	\$ 584,711.40	\$ 424,346.17	\$ 118,368.47	\$ 41,996.76	13
GROUP HOSPITALIZATION AND MEDICAL SERVICES, INC. D/B/A CAREFIRST BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD	\$ 164,632.96	\$ 85,513.04	\$ 43,751.59	\$ 28,743.63	\$ 13,017.82	2
HEALTHNOW NEW YORK INC. D/B/A BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF WESTERN NEW YORK, INC.	\$ 175,695.31	\$ 52,708.59	\$ 30,790.70	\$ 17,796.05	\$ 4,121.84	3
	\$ 443,625.10	\$ 138,295.74	\$ 42,324.52	\$ 68,017.82	\$ 27,953.41	6

HIGHMARK BCBSD, INC. D/B/A HIGHMARK BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD DELAWARE	\$ 88,038.58	\$ 26,411.57	\$ 22,621.22	\$ 494.55	\$ 3,295.80	2
HIGHMARK WEST VIRGINIA INC.	\$ 169,833.42	\$ 42,458.36	\$ 3,917.05	\$ 38,541.31	\$ -	1
HIGHMARK, INC. D/B/A HIGHMARK BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD D/B/A HIGHMARK BLUE SHIELD	\$ 2,139,466.29	\$ 773,847.26	\$ 408,170.40	\$ 260,424.48	\$ 105,252.38	36
HORIZON BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF NEW JERSEY ALSO KNOWN AS BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF NEW JERSEY	\$ 509,410.91	\$ 288,589.44	\$ 208,115.23	\$ 65,176.12	\$ 15,298.08	19
INDEPENDENCE HEALTH GROUP, INC., INCLUDING ITS SUBSIDIARIES	\$ 106,012.10	\$ 43,170.50	\$ 32,501.11	\$ 7,354.50	\$ 3,314.89	5
LIFETIME HEALTHCARE, INC. D/B/A EXCELLUS BLUECROSS BLUESHIELD	\$ 80,761.66	\$ 24,228.50	\$ 11,958.28	\$ 10,648.73	\$ 1,621.49	2
LOUISIANA HEALTH SERVICE & INDEMNITY CO. D/B/A BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF LOUISIANA	\$ 512,355.24	\$ 158,012.13	\$ 108,432.96	\$ 49,579.17	\$ -	4
NORIDIAN MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY D/B/A BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF NORTH DAKOTA	\$ 11,129.18	\$ 3,338.75	\$ 1,685.62	\$ 1,653.13	\$ -	1
PREMERA BLUE CROSS AND PREMERA BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF ALASKA	\$ 416,545.10	\$ 124,963.53	\$ 52,855.59	\$ 53,128.15	\$ 18,979.79	13
REGENCE BLUECROSS BLUESHIELD OF UTAH	\$ 42,131.98	\$ 12,639.59	\$ 8,065.71	\$ 3,446.20	\$ 1,127.68	2
RIGHTCHOICE MANAGED CARE, INC. D/B/A	\$ 172,389.43	\$ 51,716.83	\$ 16,769.84	\$ 29,065.88	\$ 5,881.11	3

ANTHEM BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD MISSOURI ROCKY MOUNTAIN HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL SERVICE, INC. D/B/A ANTHEM BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF COLORADO	\$ 492,250.00	\$ 231,240.70	\$ 138,950.95	\$ 68,445.54	\$ 23,844.21	6
WELLMARK, INC. D/B/A WELLMARK BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF IOWA D/B/A BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF IOWA	\$ 25,280.81	\$ 7,584.24	\$ 5,360.70	\$ 2,119.21	\$ 104.33	2
PLANO	\$ 26,242,766.71	\$ 12,109,867.14	\$ 8,203,559.37	\$ 2,830,933.40	\$ 1,072,093.53	526
ANTHEM BLUE CROSS LIFE AND HEALTH INS. CO., A.K.A. BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF CALIFORNIA	\$ 1,429,777.02	\$ 860,287.05	\$ 618,070.99	\$ 165,858.75	\$ 76,357.31	40
ANTHEM HEALTH PLANS OF KENTUCKY, INC.	\$ 312,352.21	\$ 93,705.66	\$ 70,279.14	\$ 17,954.71	\$ 5,471.81	2
ANTHEM HEALTH PLANS OF VIRGINIA, INC. D/B/A BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF VIRGINIA	\$ 172,779.30	\$ 61,680.61	\$ 28,715.03	\$ 19,262.41	\$ 13,703.18	6
ANTHEM HEALTH PLANS, INC. D/B/A ANTHEM BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD CONNECTICUT	\$ 227,455.77	\$ 187,543.86	\$ 133,165.76	\$ 37,011.72	\$ 17,366.38	6
ANTHEM INSURANCE COMPANIES, INC. ALSO D/B/A BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF INDIANA	\$ 3,096,591.57	\$ 1,990,257.52	\$ 1,346,241.77	\$ 516,287.24	\$ 124,447.67	57

ARKANSAS BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD	\$ 724,667.46	\$ 278,699.02	\$ 174,638.66	\$ 68,072.23	\$ 35,988.13	17
BCBSM, INC. D/B/A BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF MINNESOTA	\$ 1,331,954.19	\$ 454,285.87	\$ 353,197.50	\$ 63,095.95	\$ 37,992.42	34
BLUE CROSS & BLUE SHIELD OF MISSISSIPPI, A MUTUAL INS. CO.	\$ 72,809.82	\$ 21,842.95	\$ 8,381.80	\$ 7,532.97	\$ 5,928.18	3
BLUE CROSS & BLUE SHIELD OF RHODE ISLAND	\$ 164,136.48	\$ 49,240.94	\$ 20,158.12	\$ 28,116.81	\$ 966.01	4
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD HEALTHCARE PLAN OF GEORGIA	\$ 441,393.55	\$ 196,097.18	\$ 149,656.52	\$ 30,132.09	\$ 16,308.57	7
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF ALABAMA	\$ 1,700,945.09	\$ 609,907.26	\$ 370,835.29	\$ 180,284.47	\$ 58,787.50	40
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF FLORIDA, INC.	\$ 580,850.61	\$ 227,263.81	\$ 132,148.24	\$ 54,825.19	\$ 40,290.38	15
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF GEORGIA, INC.	\$ 1,040,028.10	\$ 592,900.92	\$ 473,332.32	\$ 62,686.54	\$ 56,882.07	15
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF KANSAS CITY	\$ 678,743.91	\$ 450,215.05	\$ 326,893.59	\$ 104,041.84	\$ 19,279.62	10
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF MASSACHUSETTS, INC ALSO DOING BUSINESS AS BLUE BENEFIT ADMINS.	\$ 731,041.10	\$ 507,657.43	\$ 442,405.36	\$ 53,849.18	\$ 11,402.89	17
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF NEBRASKA	\$ 1,078,862.09	\$ 409,681.56	\$ 215,300.88	\$ 162,731.03	\$ 31,649.65	18
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF NORTH CAROLINA	\$ 771,970.64	\$ 312,197.86	\$ 214,088.64	\$ 42,253.30	\$ 55,855.92	13
BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF SOUTH CAROLINA	\$ 340,638.89	\$ 102,191.67	\$ 11,836.97	\$ 85,433.94	\$ 4,920.76	3
BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF KANSAS, INC.	\$ 28,287.33	\$ 8,486.20	\$ 7,765.99	\$ 576.62	\$ 143.59	2
BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF MICHIGAN	\$ 731,661.17	\$ 271,578.94	\$ 245,870.42	\$ 20,306.21	\$ 5,402.31	14
BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF	\$ 229,393.67	\$ 68,818.10	\$ 45,987.97	\$ 22,830.13	\$ -	1

WISCONSIN D/B/A ANTHEM BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF WISCONSIN						
BLUE CROSS OF CALIFORNIA D/B/A ANTHEM BLUE CROSS	\$ 52,139.11	\$ 31,283.47	\$ 26,197.48	\$ 2,257.96	\$ 2,828.03	2
BLUE CROSS OF IDAHO CARE PLUS, INC. AND BLUE CROSS OF IDAHO HEALTH SERVICE, INC. D/B/A BLUE CROSS OF IDAHO	\$ 195,088.40	\$ 58,526.52	\$ 34,662.60	\$ 15,020.23	\$ 8,843.69	5
BLUEADVANTAGE ADMINISTRATORS OF ARKANSAS	\$ 852,606.19	\$ 255,781.86	\$ 61,442.56	\$ 96,612.75	\$ 97,726.55	11
BLUECROSS BLUESHIELD OF TENNESSEE, INC.	\$ 785,747.79	\$ 420,927.14	\$ 276,460.43	\$ 88,997.90	\$ 55,468.81	23
CALIFORNIA PHYSICIANS' SERVICE, PREVIOUSLY IDENTIFIED AS BLUE SHIELD OF CALIFORNIA LIFE & HEALTH INSURANCE COMPANY D/B/A BLUE SHIELD OF CALIFORNIA	\$ 638,376.01	\$ 464,210.05	\$ 447,879.18	\$ 7,933.50	\$ 8,397.37	15
CAPITAL BLUECROSS ALSO KNOWN AS CAPITAL BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD AND CAPITAL HOSPITAL SERVICE	\$ 14,370.74	\$ 14,370.74	\$ 13,465.47	\$ 205.27	\$ 700.00	1
COMMUNITY INS. CO. D/B/A ANTHEM BLUE CROSS OF OHIO AND/OR BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF OHIO	\$ 478,218.15	\$ 381,204.23	\$ 249,270.44	\$ 71,721.45	\$ 60,212.34	19
EMPIRE HEALTHCHOICE ASSURANCE, INC. D/B/A EMPIRE BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD AND AS	\$ 283,940.19	\$ 103,438.91	\$ 53,485.57	\$ 43,697.35	\$ 6,255.99	3

BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF NEW YORK GROUP HOSPITALIZATION AND MEDICAL SERVICES, INC. D/B/A CAREFIRST BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD	\$ 1,195,880.45	\$ 358,764.14	\$ 196,100.70	\$ 148,243.08	\$ 14,420.36	13
HEALTHNOW NEW YORK INC. D/B/A BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF WESTERN NEW YORK, INC.	\$ 580,831.79	\$ 362,981.52	\$ 282,070.02	\$ 65,530.81	\$ 15,380.69	11
HIGHMARK, INC. D/B/A HIGHMARK BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD D/B/A HIGHMARK BLUE SHIELD	\$ 1,502,194.58	\$ 480,599.54	\$ 294,142.90	\$ 137,633.17	\$ 48,823.47	24
HORIZON BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF NEW JERSEY ALSO KNOWN AS BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF NEW JERSEY	\$ 143,836.66	\$ 80,548.53	\$ 31,988.24	\$ 38,354.26	\$ 10,206.03	5
INDEPENDENCE HEALTH GROUP, INC., INCLUDING ITS SUBSIDIARIES	\$ 508,584.83	\$ 235,775.13	\$ 182,480.10	\$ 38,075.80	\$ 15,219.23	10
LOUISIANA HEALTH SERVICE & INDEMNITY COMPANY D/B/A BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF LOUISIANA	\$ 1,713,511.89	\$ 589,895.97	\$ 342,744.14	\$ 192,842.75	\$ 54,309.08	21
NORIDIAN MUTUAL INSURANCE COMPANY D/B/A BLUE CROSS BLUE SHIELD OF NORTH DAKOTA	\$ 53,351.22	\$ 26,163.80	\$ 15,313.21	\$ 10,394.87	\$ 455.72	3
PREMERA BLUE CROSS AND PREMERA BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF ALASKA	\$ 732,590.08	\$ 302,496.52	\$ 178,987.71	\$ 85,661.77	\$ 37,847.04	16
REGENCE BLUECROSS	\$ 100,646.79	\$ 30,194.04	\$ 16,203.90	\$ 10,255.30	\$ 3,734.84	2

BLUESHIELD OF UTAH REGENCE BLUESHIELD, ALSO DOING BUSINESS AS REGENCE GROUP ADMINISTRATORS	\$ 17,488.44	\$ 5,246.53	\$ 2,453.50	\$ 1,650.99	\$ 1,142.04	1
RIGHTCHOICE MANAGED CARE, INC. D/B/A ANTHEM BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD MISSOURI D/B/A BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF MISSOURI	\$ 117,413.36	\$ 35,224.01	\$ 30,885.46	\$ 2,764.95	\$ 1,573.60	2
ROCKY MOUNTAIN HOSPITAL AND MEDICAL SERVICE, INC. D/B/A ANTHEM BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF COLORADO OF NEVADA	\$ 119,406.54	\$ 41,278.47	\$ 21,033.82	\$ 13,791.08	\$ 6,453.57	4
WELLMARK, INC. D/B/A WELLMARK BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF IOWA D/B/A BLUE CROSS AND BLUE SHIELD OF IOWA	\$ 270,203.53	\$ 76,416.56	\$ 57,320.99	\$ 16,144.83	\$ 2,950.74	11
GRAND TOTAL	\$ 116,376,352.79	\$ 59,988,447.59	\$ 43,162,553.66	\$ 12,481,839.08	\$ 4,340,774.01	1896

SCHEDULE 1B

Facility Name	Claim Billed Amount	Estimated Expected Reimbursm't	Estimated Amount Due	TTL Insurance Payments	Estimated Patient Copay, Deductible, Co-Insurance	# of Claims
Anthem Blue Cross Life and Health Insurance Company, also known as Blue Cross Blue Shield of California	\$ 6,123,367.36	\$ 3,509,174.33	\$ 2,454,684.31	\$ 748,699.09	\$ 305,790.93	136
Beaumont	\$ 611,397.74	\$ 291,744.34	\$ 211,391.69	\$ 56,699.49	\$ 23,653.16	18
Craig Ranch	\$ 1,742,620.76	\$ 1,048,934.25	\$ 686,425.92	\$ 278,492.26	\$ 84,016.07	33
East Houston	\$ 148,157.04	\$ 50,469.24	\$ 40,812.12	\$ 4,559.89	\$ 5,097.23	4
Innova / Southcross	\$ 347,893.26	\$ 180,086.47	\$ 137,743.06	\$ 26,029.26	\$ 16,314.15	6
Landmark	\$ 447,268.16	\$ 175,394.47	\$ 124,735.73	\$ 35,554.07	\$ 15,104.67	7
Mid-Cities	\$ 1,396,253.38	\$ 902,258.53	\$ 635,504.81	\$ 181,505.37	\$ 85,248.35	28
Plano	\$ 1,429,777.02	\$ 860,287.05	\$ 618,070.99	\$ 165,858.75	\$ 76,357.31	40
Anthem Health Plans of Kentucky, Inc.	\$ 2,812,288.99	\$ 1,500,214.09	\$ 1,111,386.09	\$ 302,672.90	\$ 86,155.10	23
Beaumont	\$ 10,066.77	\$ 3,020.03	\$ 3,020.03	\$ -	\$ -	1
East Houston	\$ 28,738.14	\$ 28,738.14	\$ 21,541.13	\$ 1,310.10	\$ 5,886.91	1
Innova / Southcross	\$ 1,289,838.29	\$ 506,745.34	\$ 376,519.26	\$ 123,236.25	\$ 6,989.83	6
Landmark	\$ 961,526.86	\$ 764,753.06	\$ 577,437.65	\$ 137,202.63	\$ 50,112.77	8
Mid-Cities	\$ 209,766.72	\$ 103,251.86	\$ 62,588.87	\$ 22,969.21	\$ 17,693.78	5
Plano	\$ 312,352.21	\$ 93,705.66	\$ 70,279.14	\$ 17,954.71	\$ 5,471.81	2
Anthem Health Plans of Virginia, Inc. d/b/a Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Virginia and/or Anthem Blue Cross Blue Shield of Virginia	\$ 2,740,499.30	\$ 1,588,310.87	\$ 1,109,241.03	\$ 387,256.41	\$ 91,813.43	39
Beaumont	\$ 557,523.73	\$ 236,788.68	\$ 163,074.67	\$ 49,765.94	\$ 23,948.07	11
Craig Ranch	\$ 85,857.10	\$ 49,473.10	\$ 33,985.41	\$ 7,653.95	\$ 7,833.74	7
East Houston	\$ 27,584.97	\$ 10,778.80	\$ 7,745.98	\$ 1,172.60	\$ 1,860.23	2
Innova / Southcross	\$ 953,385.32	\$ 537,921.71	\$ 364,473.90	\$ 163,561.05	\$ 9,886.76	4
Landmark	\$ 491,140.05	\$ 491,140.05	\$ 427,516.59	\$ 61,564.25	\$ 2,059.21	2
Mid-Cities	\$ 452,228.83	\$ 200,527.91	\$ 83,729.45	\$ 84,276.21	\$ 32,522.25	7
Plano	\$ 172,779.30	\$ 61,680.61	\$ 28,715.03	\$ 19,262.41	\$ 13,703.18	6
Anthem Health Plans, Inc. d/b/a Anthem Blue Cross	\$ 316,750.31	\$ 243,758.06	\$ 166,937.51	\$ 49,151.39	\$ 27,669.16	10

and Blue Shield Connecticut						
Beaumont	\$ 29,811.66	\$ 15,888.78	\$ 12,031.90	\$ 1,431.18	\$ 2,425.70	2
Craig Ranch	\$ 17,836.24	\$ 17,836.24	\$ 9,459.99	\$ 5,080.30	\$ 3,295.95	1
Landmark	\$ 41,646.64	\$ 22,489.19	\$ 12,279.87	\$ 5,628.19	\$ 4,581.13	1
Plano	\$ 227,455.77	\$ 187,543.86	\$ 133,165.76	\$ 37,011.72	\$ 17,366.38	6
Anthem Insurance Companies, Inc. also d/b/a Blue Cross Blue Shield of Indiana	\$16,446,132.50	\$11,216,946.33	\$ 8,158,972.97	\$2,404,707.06	\$ 649,985.45	203
Beaumont	\$ 958,599.51	\$ 864,524.18	\$ 645,161.22	\$ 124,721.99	\$ 94,640.97	21
Craig Ranch	\$ 510,759.31	\$ 388,834.04	\$ 250,396.14	\$ 80,866.09	\$ 57,571.81	13
East Houston	\$ 114,685.58	\$ 56,449.74	\$ 38,316.71	\$ 6,867.35	\$ 11,265.67	6
Innova / Southcross	\$ 4,748,497.70	\$ 2,737,243.22	\$ 2,160,371.64	\$ 463,397.23	\$ 113,474.34	37
Landmark	\$ 5,751,818.12	\$ 4,288,405.86	\$ 3,126,660.55	\$1,000,319.62	\$ 161,425.69	35
Mid-Cities	\$ 1,265,180.71	\$ 891,231.77	\$ 591,824.94	\$ 212,247.54	\$ 87,159.29	34
Plano	\$ 3,096,591.57	\$ 1,990,257.52	\$ 1,346,241.77	\$ 516,287.24	\$ 124,447.67	57
Arkansas Blue Cross and Blue Shield	\$ 867,927.27	\$ 346,365.15	\$ 220,942.02	\$ 80,221.97	\$ 45,201.15	21
Beaumont	\$ 8,198.94	\$ 2,459.68	\$ 1,557.80	\$ -	\$ 901.88	1
Craig Ranch	\$ 60,681.90	\$ 18,204.57	\$ 8,817.53	\$ 6,105.38	\$ 3,281.66	1
Mid-Cities	\$ 74,378.97	\$ 47,001.87	\$ 35,928.03	\$ 6,044.36	\$ 5,029.48	2
Plano	\$ 724,667.46	\$ 278,699.02	\$ 174,638.66	\$ 68,072.23	\$ 35,988.13	17
BCBSM, Inc. d/b/a Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Minnesota	\$ 6,182,335.66	\$ 2,051,769.23	\$ 1,453,811.91	\$ 434,574.00	\$ 163,383.32	83
Beaumont	\$ 583,708.15	\$ 281,702.27	\$ 219,421.59	\$ 46,778.51	\$ 15,502.17	7
Craig Ranch	\$ 894,226.66	\$ 280,183.77	\$ 185,206.44	\$ 65,845.55	\$ 29,131.79	14
East Houston	\$ 62,084.95	\$ 22,563.15	\$ 19,836.37	\$ 1,660.73	\$ 1,066.05	4
Innova / Southcross	\$ 152,430.65	\$ 59,045.98	\$ 35,257.91	\$ 14,551.74	\$ 9,236.33	6
Landmark	\$ 1,996,649.52	\$ 604,736.78	\$ 381,833.25	\$ 159,063.67	\$ 63,839.86	9
Mid-Cities	\$ 1,161,281.54	\$ 349,251.40	\$ 259,058.84	\$ 83,577.85	\$ 6,614.71	9
Plano	\$ 1,331,954.19	\$ 454,285.87	\$ 353,197.50	\$ 63,095.95	\$ 37,992.42	34
Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Mississippi, a Mutual Insurance Company	\$ 320,332.32	\$ 109,662.76	\$ 57,389.80	\$ 41,098.27	\$ 11,174.69	7
Beaumont	\$ 34,237.41	\$ 10,271.22	\$ 6,288.43	\$ 1,586.17	\$ 2,396.62	1
Craig Ranch	\$ 52,165.64	\$ 29,212.76	\$ 21,217.92	\$ 7,644.95	\$ 349.89	1
East Houston	\$ 71,436.31	\$ 21,430.89	\$ 10,912.63	\$ 10,518.26	\$ -	1
Landmark	\$ 89,683.14	\$ 26,904.94	\$ 10,589.02	\$ 13,815.92	\$ 2,500.00	1
Plano	\$ 72,809.82	\$ 21,842.95	\$ 8,381.80	\$ 7,532.97	\$ 5,928.18	3

Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Rhode Island	\$ 457,859.23	\$ 158,516.06	\$ 100,040.80	\$ 45,326.46	\$ 13,148.80	13
Beaumont	\$ 375.00	\$ 112.50	\$ 93.75	\$ -	\$ 18.75	1
Craig Ranch	\$ 15,161.95	\$ 15,161.95	\$ 13,940.54	\$ 577.14	\$ 644.27	1
East Houston	\$ 10,524.15	\$ 3,157.25	\$ 1,693.70	\$ -	\$ 1,463.55	1
Innova / Southcross	\$ 93,347.47	\$ 38,549.17	\$ 30,681.97	\$ 5,893.85	\$ 1,973.35	2
Landmark	\$ 49,090.89	\$ 14,727.27	\$ 9,759.54	\$ 3,283.33	\$ 1,684.39	2
Mid-Cities	\$ 125,223.29	\$ 37,566.99	\$ 23,713.18	\$ 7,455.33	\$ 6,398.48	2
Plano	\$ 164,136.48	\$ 49,240.94	\$ 20,158.12	\$ 28,116.81	\$ 966.01	4
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Healthcare Plan of Georgia	\$ 699,053.10	\$ 310,909.32	\$ 229,959.78	\$ 49,507.56	\$ 31,441.98	13
Craig Ranch	\$ 178,382.31	\$ 63,133.30	\$ 40,956.14	\$ 15,778.10	\$ 6,399.06	3
Landmark	\$ 39,426.29	\$ 11,827.89	\$ 4,622.18	\$ 2,809.09	\$ 4,396.62	2
Mid-Cities	\$ 39,850.95	\$ 39,850.95	\$ 34,724.94	\$ 788.28	\$ 4,337.73	1
Plano	\$ 441,393.55	\$ 196,097.18	\$ 149,656.52	\$ 30,132.09	\$ 16,308.57	7
Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Alabama	\$ 8,096,160.07	\$ 3,832,411.21	\$ 2,624,763.24	\$ 930,077.76	\$ 277,570.21	136
Beaumont	\$ 897,519.32	\$ 405,656.73	\$ 305,420.45	\$ 61,590.15	\$ 38,646.12	27
Craig Ranch	\$ 1,291,222.00	\$ 777,031.81	\$ 545,213.89	\$ 173,101.76	\$ 58,716.16	25
East Houston	\$ 72,980.11	\$ 65,095.46	\$ 56,496.04	\$ 2,289.68	\$ 6,309.74	3
Innova / Southcross	\$ 118,044.34	\$ 74,245.87	\$ 52,918.80	\$ 14,790.43	\$ 6,536.64	2
Landmark	\$ 856,903.77	\$ 555,654.00	\$ 473,094.37	\$ 62,079.02	\$ 20,480.61	8
Mid-Cities	\$ 3,158,545.44	\$ 1,344,820.09	\$ 820,784.40	\$ 435,942.25	\$ 88,093.44	31
Plano	\$ 1,700,945.09	\$ 609,907.26	\$ 370,835.29	\$ 180,284.47	\$ 58,787.50	40
Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Florida, Inc. d/b/a Florida Blue	\$ 1,133,678.22	\$ 460,233.41	\$ 304,673.37	\$ 96,043.61	\$ 59,516.43	32
Beaumont	\$ 72,950.81	\$ 57,052.56	\$ 48,367.50	\$ 6,646.72	\$ 2,038.34	8
Craig Ranch	\$ 100,599.68	\$ 62,399.18	\$ 56,135.88	\$ 2,771.26	\$ 3,492.04	3
East Houston	\$ 68,880.67	\$ 20,664.20	\$ 9,543.51	\$ 7,030.94	\$ 4,089.75	2
Landmark	\$ 146,434.16	\$ 51,863.10	\$ 41,437.71	\$ 3,233.23	\$ 7,192.16	3
Mid-Cities	\$ 163,962.29	\$ 40,990.57	\$ 17,040.54	\$ 21,536.27	\$ 2,413.76	1
Plano	\$ 580,850.61	\$ 227,263.81	\$ 132,148.24	\$ 54,825.19	\$ 40,290.38	15
Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Georgia, Inc.	\$ 5,858,017.70	\$ 4,489,589.55	\$ 3,447,754.83	\$ 799,046.51	\$ 242,788.21	85
Beaumont	\$ 897,003.88	\$ 475,759.03	\$ 302,228.33	\$ 108,985.90	\$ 64,544.80	34
Craig Ranch	\$ 224,056.67	\$ 178,896.34	\$ 132,298.39	\$ 29,041.16	\$ 17,556.79	6
East Houston	\$ 139,233.39	\$ 107,290.46	\$ 93,086.92	\$ 9,691.81	\$ 4,511.73	4
Innova / Southcross	\$ 2,601,057.77	\$ 2,537,193.67	\$ 2,034,365.63	\$ 464,432.73	\$ 38,395.31	9
Landmark	\$ 317,277.89	\$ 165,251.17	\$ 77,964.66	\$ 61,261.33	\$ 26,025.19	7
Mid-Cities	\$ 639,360.00	\$ 432,297.97	\$ 334,478.59	\$ 62,947.04	\$ 34,872.34	10

Plano	\$ 1,040,028.10	\$ 592,900.92	\$ 473,332.32	\$ 62,686.54	\$ 56,882.07	15
Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas City	\$ 1,136,185.86	\$ 678,023.61	\$ 460,434.78	\$ 175,376.00	\$ 42,212.84	18
Craig Ranch	\$ 93,097.04	\$ 82,541.04	\$ 71,901.53	\$ 7,235.73	\$ 3,403.78	3
East Houston	\$ 21,122.93	\$ 13,738.95	\$ 10,625.59	\$ 1,568.05	\$ 1,545.31	2
Mid-Cities	\$ 343,221.98	\$ 131,528.58	\$ 51,014.07	\$ 62,530.38	\$ 17,984.13	3
Plano	\$ 678,743.91	\$ 450,215.05	\$ 326,893.59	\$ 104,041.84	\$ 19,279.62	10
Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Massachusetts, Inc also doing business as Blue Benefit Administrators	\$ 2,177,970.42	\$ 1,406,398.12	\$ 1,220,693.71	\$ 144,619.48	\$ 41,084.93	53
Beaumont	\$ 146,890.31	\$ 96,017.16	\$ 84,647.58	\$ 3,675.76	\$ 7,693.82	6
Craig Ranch	\$ 458,727.10	\$ 358,150.98	\$ 327,383.55	\$ 20,433.29	\$ 10,334.15	12
East Houston	\$ 46,261.03	\$ 46,261.03	\$ 46,261.03	\$ -	\$ -	2
Innova / Southcross	\$ 195,823.92	\$ 69,856.32	\$ 57,989.38	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 1,866.94	3
Landmark	\$ 220,107.52	\$ 122,152.84	\$ 102,918.85	\$ 16,333.99	\$ 2,900.00	3
Mid-Cities	\$ 379,119.44	\$ 206,302.37	\$ 159,087.98	\$ 40,327.26	\$ 6,887.13	10
Plano	\$ 731,041.10	\$ 507,657.43	\$ 442,405.36	\$ 53,849.18	\$ 11,402.89	17
Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Nebraska	\$ 1,663,308.39	\$ 675,234.21	\$ 396,309.30	\$ 215,325.41	\$ 63,599.50	37
Beaumont	\$ 54,020.98	\$ 39,829.42	\$ 36,515.73	\$ 1,288.10	\$ 2,025.59	3
Craig Ranch	\$ 287,331.11	\$ 101,514.96	\$ 62,993.72	\$ 28,948.16	\$ 9,573.08	4
East Houston	\$ 67,461.16	\$ 53,585.51	\$ 45,426.13	\$ 4,786.32	\$ 3,373.06	2
Innova / Southcross	\$ 25,618.35	\$ 25,618.35	\$ 14,329.84	\$ 5,573.10	\$ 5,715.41	1
Mid-Cities	\$ 150,014.70	\$ 45,004.41	\$ 21,743.00	\$ 11,998.70	\$ 11,262.71	9
Plano	\$ 1,078,862.09	\$ 409,681.56	\$ 215,300.88	\$ 162,731.03	\$ 31,649.65	18
Blue Cross and Blue Shield of North Carolina	\$ 2,312,640.64	\$ 1,300,718.01	\$ 973,691.11	\$ 187,379.48	\$ 139,647.42	38
Beaumont	\$ 183,312.43	\$ 152,544.58	\$ 131,941.93	\$ 9,212.22	\$ 11,390.43	5
Craig Ranch	\$ 399,150.01	\$ 253,528.89	\$ 177,369.41	\$ 41,131.76	\$ 35,027.72	8
Innova / Southcross	\$ 285,898.85	\$ 85,769.66	\$ 43,661.54	\$ 26,029.05	\$ 16,079.07	6
Landmark	\$ 435,566.08	\$ 425,654.23	\$ 389,992.53	\$ 20,385.87	\$ 15,275.83	4
Mid-Cities	\$ 236,742.63	\$ 71,022.79	\$ 16,637.06	\$ 48,367.28	\$ 6,018.45	2
Plano	\$ 771,970.64	\$ 312,197.86	\$ 214,088.64	\$ 42,253.30	\$ 55,855.92	13
Blue Cross and Blue Shield of South Carolina	\$ 1,720,722.08	\$ 605,333.52	\$ 320,999.79	\$ 190,471.70	\$ 93,862.03	24
Beaumont	\$ 526,409.09	\$ 156,688.06	\$ 116,960.29	\$ 14,297.19	\$ 25,430.58	9
Craig Ranch	\$ 133,179.90	\$ 65,428.35	\$ 44,555.90	\$ 8,921.82	\$ 11,950.63	4
Innova / Southcross	\$ 544,573.45	\$ 178,443.12	\$ 78,173.41	\$ 62,936.17	\$ 37,333.54	3
Landmark	\$ 77,887.78	\$ 35,018.87	\$ 18,364.85	\$ 6,752.06	\$ 9,901.96	2

Mid-Cities	\$ 98,032.97	\$ 67,563.45	\$ 51,108.37	\$ 12,130.52	\$ 4,324.57	3
Plano	\$ 340,638.89	\$ 102,191.67	\$ 11,836.97	\$ 85,433.94	\$ 4,920.76	3
Blue Cross Blue Shield of Kansas, Inc.	\$ 318,275.44	\$ 95,482.63	\$ 86,579.29	\$ 7,309.40	\$ 1,593.94	11
Innova / Southcross	\$ 132,626.81	\$ 39,788.04	\$ 36,943.85	\$ 2,844.19	\$ -	1
Mid-Cities	\$ 157,361.30	\$ 47,208.39	\$ 41,869.45	\$ 3,888.59	\$ 1,450.35	8
Plano	\$ 28,287.33	\$ 8,486.20	\$ 7,765.99	\$ 576.62	\$ 143.59	2
Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan	\$ 1,555,386.24	\$ 535,230.02	\$ 441,050.05	\$ 73,110.33	\$ 21,069.65	38
Beaumont	\$ 4,339.23	\$ 1,301.77	\$ 601.65	\$ 483.16	\$ 216.96	1
Craig Ranch	\$ 41,562.15	\$ 12,468.65	\$ 10,038.86	\$ -	\$ 2,429.79	2
East Houston	\$ 50,669.21	\$ 14,157.28	\$ 6,154.91	\$ 6,988.99	\$ 1,013.38	2
Innova / Southcross	\$ 373,081.67	\$ 111,924.50	\$ 72,800.68	\$ 30,296.78	\$ 8,827.04	7
Landmark	\$ 39,812.09	\$ 29,520.66	\$ 29,520.66	\$ -	\$ -	2
Mid-Cities	\$ 314,260.72	\$ 94,278.22	\$ 76,062.87	\$ 15,035.19	\$ 3,180.16	10
Plano	\$ 731,661.17	\$ 271,578.94	\$ 245,870.42	\$ 20,306.21	\$ 5,402.31	14
Blue Cross Blue Shield of Wisconsin d/b/a Anthem Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Wisconsin	\$ 549,696.55	\$ 335,572.24	\$ 249,692.01	\$ 74,436.72	\$ 11,443.50	9
Craig Ranch	\$ 222,108.35	\$ 206,647.48	\$ 159,145.94	\$ 42,960.49	\$ 4,541.05	3
East Houston	\$ 27,845.77	\$ 8,353.73	\$ 2,693.28	\$ 2,597.42	\$ 3,063.03	1
Mid-Cities	\$ 70,348.76	\$ 51,752.92	\$ 41,864.82	\$ 6,048.68	\$ 3,839.42	4
Plano	\$ 229,393.67	\$ 68,818.10	\$ 45,987.97	\$ 22,830.13	\$ -	1
Blue Cross of California d/b/a Anthem Blue Cross	\$ 225,507.06	\$ 83,293.85	\$ 57,121.94	\$ 15,309.09	\$ 10,862.82	6
Beaumont	\$ 4,888.32	\$ 1,466.50	\$ 1,222.08	\$ -	\$ 244.42	2
Mid-Cities	\$ 168,479.63	\$ 50,543.89	\$ 29,702.38	\$ 13,051.13	\$ 7,790.38	2
Plano	\$ 52,139.11	\$ 31,283.47	\$ 26,197.48	\$ 2,257.96	\$ 2,828.03	2
Blue Cross of Idaho Care Plus, Inc. and Blue Cross of Idaho Health Service, Inc. d/b/a Blue Cross of Idaho	\$ 398,061.96	\$ 118,530.70	\$ 70,740.18	\$ 28,956.34	\$ 18,834.18	10
Mid-Cities	\$ 202,973.56	\$ 60,004.18	\$ 36,077.58	\$ 13,936.11	\$ 9,990.49	5
Plano	\$ 195,088.40	\$ 58,526.52	\$ 34,662.60	\$ 15,020.23	\$ 8,843.69	5
BlueAdvantage Administrators of Arkansas	\$ 2,550,818.80	\$ 917,061.66	\$ 442,895.23	\$ 218,404.06	\$ 255,762.38	53
Beaumont	\$ 186,739.30	\$ 56,021.79	\$ 17,713.87	\$ 18,789.61	\$ 19,518.31	6
Craig Ranch	\$ 599,633.79	\$ 256,256.22	\$ 158,414.11	\$ 50,451.23	\$ 47,390.88	12
East Houston	\$ 139,529.08	\$ 73,966.63	\$ 56,937.79	\$ 1,680.64	\$ 15,348.20	7
Innova / Southcross	\$ 61,939.09	\$ 18,581.73	\$ 13,356.51	\$ 1,954.51	\$ 3,270.71	4

Landmark	\$ 279,768.09	\$ 115,296.80	\$ 74,962.69	\$ 15,481.50	\$ 24,852.61	7
Mid-Cities	\$ 430,603.26	\$ 141,156.63	\$ 60,067.69	\$ 33,433.82	\$ 47,655.12	6
Plano	\$ 852,606.19	\$ 255,781.86	\$ 61,442.56	\$ 96,612.75	\$ 97,726.55	11
BlueCross BlueShield of Tennessee, Inc.	\$ 8,327,558.17	\$ 5,168,914.25	\$ 3,923,787.72	\$ 934,006.11	\$ 311,120.42	107
Beaumont	\$ 1,539,796.50	\$ 862,766.83	\$ 640,572.38	\$ 151,341.97	\$ 70,852.49	30
Craig Ranch	\$ 386,578.30	\$ 214,511.55	\$ 164,349.14	\$ 28,583.15	\$ 21,579.26	6
East Houston	\$ 61,108.55	\$ 33,027.13	\$ 28,767.32	\$ 792.95	\$ 3,466.87	4
Innova / Southcross	\$ 2,707,615.12	\$ 2,268,850.45	\$ 1,762,829.16	\$ 473,016.84	\$ 33,004.45	10
Landmark	\$ 1,926,436.70	\$ 994,590.66	\$ 822,175.20	\$ 96,568.27	\$ 75,847.19	14
Mid-Cities	\$ 920,275.21	\$ 374,240.48	\$ 228,634.10	\$ 94,705.03	\$ 50,901.35	20
Plano	\$ 785,747.79	\$ 420,927.14	\$ 276,460.43	\$ 88,997.90	\$ 55,468.81	23
California Physicians' Service, previously identified as Blue Shield of California Life & Health Insurance Company d/b/a Blue Shield of California	\$ 1,374,776.59	\$ 849,007.28	\$ 807,509.84	\$ 28,325.21	\$ 13,172.23	30
Craig Ranch	\$ 206,889.34	\$ 144,659.14	\$ 131,935.76	\$ 10,946.88	\$ 1,776.50	5
Innova / Southcross	\$ 280,499.70	\$ 84,149.91	\$ 75,023.38	\$ 7,334.83	\$ 1,791.70	4
Mid-Cities	\$ 249,011.54	\$ 155,988.18	\$ 152,671.52	\$ 2,110.00	\$ 1,206.66	6
Plano	\$ 638,376.01	\$ 464,210.05	\$ 447,879.18	\$ 7,933.50	\$ 8,397.37	15
Capital BlueCross also known as Capital Blue Cross Blue Shield and Capital Hospital Service	\$ 674,577.49	\$ 298,408.22	\$ 192,693.48	\$ 90,493.57	\$ 15,221.17	15
Beaumont	\$ 196,001.76	\$ 108,974.41	\$ 85,020.68	\$ 21,923.87	\$ 2,029.86	4
Craig Ranch	\$ 19,661.82	\$ 19,661.82	\$ 18,015.77	\$ 146.05	\$ 1,500.00	1
East Houston	\$ 39,302.77	\$ 11,790.83	\$ 5,269.77	\$ 5,735.01	\$ 786.06	1
Innova / Southcross	\$ 280,328.93	\$ 106,136.98	\$ 44,239.95	\$ 56,194.52	\$ 5,702.50	4
Landmark	\$ 124,152.64	\$ 37,245.79	\$ 26,492.14	\$ 6,288.85	\$ 4,464.80	3
Mid-Cities	\$ 758.83	\$ 227.65	\$ 189.71	\$ -	\$ 37.94	1
Plano	\$ 14,370.74	\$ 14,370.74	\$ 13,465.47	\$ 205.27	\$ 700.00	1
Community Insurance Company d/b/a Anthem Blue Cross of Ohio and/or Blue Cross Blue Shield of Ohio	\$ 3,902,979.86	\$ 2,193,762.50	\$ 1,525,441.47	\$ 416,836.08	\$ 251,484.95	77
Beaumont	\$ 975,892.38	\$ 407,573.13	\$ 238,008.14	\$ 74,840.69	\$ 94,724.30	14
Craig Ranch	\$ 504,724.35	\$ 319,942.49	\$ 221,453.10	\$ 68,662.41	\$ 29,826.98	12

East Houston	\$ 133,707.16	\$ 95,086.61	\$ 78,379.26	\$ 11,457.56	\$ 5,249.79	9
Innova / Southcross	\$ 907,244.36	\$ 394,353.51	\$ 306,430.78	\$ 71,366.75	\$ 16,555.99	9
Landmark	\$ 10,891.12	\$ 10,891.12	\$ 7,553.58	\$ 418.75	\$ 2,918.79	1
Mid-Cities	\$ 892,302.34	\$ 584,711.40	\$ 424,346.17	\$ 118,368.47	\$ 41,996.76	13
Plano	\$ 478,218.15	\$ 381,204.23	\$ 249,270.44	\$ 71,721.45	\$ 60,212.34	19
Empire HealthChoice Assurance, Inc. d/b/a Empire Blue Cross Blue Shield and as Blue Cross Blue Shield of New York	\$ 1,469,542.41	\$ 755,965.32	\$ 550,261.72	\$ 165,565.08	\$ 40,138.52	16
Beaumont	\$ 83,986.23	\$ 25,195.87	\$ 9,811.95	\$ 10,344.75	\$ 5,039.17	1
Innova / Southcross	\$ 665,187.82	\$ 373,971.70	\$ 329,231.64	\$ 34,563.70	\$ 10,176.36	7
Landmark	\$ 271,795.21	\$ 167,845.80	\$ 113,980.97	\$ 48,215.65	\$ 5,649.18	3
Mid-Cities	\$ 164,632.96	\$ 85,513.04	\$ 43,751.59	\$ 28,743.63	\$ 13,017.82	2
Plano	\$ 283,940.19	\$ 103,438.91	\$ 53,485.57	\$ 43,697.35	\$ 6,255.99	3
Group Hospitalization and Medical Services, Inc. d/b/a CareFirst Blue Cross Blue Shield	\$ 2,931,654.94	\$ 893,707.08	\$ 611,628.81	\$ 243,896.51	\$ 38,181.76	30
East Houston	\$ 39,952.69	\$ 26,196.40	\$ 20,131.05	\$ 4,670.25	\$ 1,395.10	2
Innova / Southcross	\$ 841,832.69	\$ 252,549.81	\$ 183,628.17	\$ 53,157.43	\$ 15,764.21	7
Landmark	\$ 678,293.80	\$ 203,488.14	\$ 180,978.18	\$ 20,029.70	\$ 2,480.26	5
Mid-Cities	\$ 175,695.31	\$ 52,708.59	\$ 30,790.70	\$ 17,796.05	\$ 4,121.84	3
Plano	\$ 1,195,880.45	\$ 358,764.14	\$ 196,100.70	\$ 148,243.08	\$ 14,420.36	13
Healthnow New York Inc. d/b/a Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Western New York, Inc.	\$ 1,481,194.13	\$ 795,633.09	\$ 549,627.22	\$ 182,398.10	\$ 63,607.77	36
Beaumont	\$ 44,112.29	\$ 13,233.69	\$ 9,642.69	\$ 2,237.08	\$ 1,353.92	4
Craig Ranch	\$ 88,549.24	\$ 88,549.24	\$ 64,235.94	\$ 17,122.47	\$ 7,190.83	4
Innova / Southcross	\$ 190,833.50	\$ 89,748.53	\$ 56,260.12	\$ 25,185.46	\$ 8,302.94	7
Landmark	\$ 133,242.21	\$ 102,824.38	\$ 95,093.93	\$ 4,304.46	\$ 3,425.99	4
Mid-Cities	\$ 443,625.10	\$ 138,295.74	\$ 42,324.52	\$ 68,017.82	\$ 27,953.41	6
Plano	\$ 580,831.79	\$ 362,981.52	\$ 282,070.02	\$ 65,530.81	\$ 15,380.69	11
Highmark BCBS, Inc. d/b/a Highmark Blue Cross Blue Shield Delaware	\$ 92,050.58	\$ 28,658.29	\$ 24,574.06	\$ 529.65	\$ 3,554.58	3
East Houston	\$ 4,012.00	\$ 2,246.72	\$ 1,952.84	\$ 35.10	\$ 258.78	1
Mid-Cities	\$ 88,038.58	\$ 26,411.57	\$ 22,621.22	\$ 494.55	\$ 3,295.80	2

Highmark West Virginia Inc.	\$ 169,833.42	\$ 42,458.36	\$ 3,917.05	\$ 38,541.31	\$ -	1
Mid-Cities	\$ 169,833.42	\$ 42,458.36	\$ 3,917.05	\$ 38,541.31	\$ -	1
Highmark, Inc. d/b/a Highmark Blue Cross Blue Shield d/b/a Highmark Blue Shield	\$ 6,681,170.17	\$ 2,592,346.16	\$ 1,674,625.57	\$ 607,524.71	\$ 310,195.88	140
Beaumont	\$ 1,284,220.84	\$ 613,292.49	\$ 463,180.15	\$ 77,756.74	\$ 72,355.60	39
Craig Ranch	\$ 672,805.09	\$ 259,386.06	\$ 166,062.53	\$ 53,507.74	\$ 39,815.78	9
East Houston	\$ 207,320.84	\$ 87,187.88	\$ 68,383.44	\$ 7,224.06	\$ 11,580.38	13
Innova / Southcross	\$ 612,435.52	\$ 281,198.07	\$ 223,154.40	\$ 39,169.73	\$ 18,873.94	10
Landmark	\$ 262,727.01	\$ 96,834.86	\$ 51,531.74	\$ 31,808.79	\$ 13,494.33	9
Mid-Cities	\$ 2,139,466.29	\$ 773,847.26	\$ 408,170.40	\$ 260,424.48	\$ 105,252.38	36
Plano	\$ 1,502,194.58	\$ 480,599.54	\$ 294,142.90	\$ 137,633.17	\$ 48,823.47	24
Horizon Blue Cross and Blue Shield of New Jersey also known as Blue Cross Blue Shield of New Jersey	\$ 1,295,636.18	\$ 871,267.71	\$ 615,408.31	\$ 214,436.74	\$ 41,422.66	41
Beaumont	\$ 827.00	\$ 248.10	\$ 206.75	\$ -	\$ 41.35	1
Craig Ranch	\$ 398,705.85	\$ 374,384.23	\$ 270,375.64	\$ 93,637.77	\$ 10,370.82	7
East Houston	\$ 11,406.60	\$ 6,387.70	\$ 4,904.92	\$ 739.67	\$ 743.11	1
Innova / Southcross	\$ 91,494.69	\$ 42,735.21	\$ 42,735.21	\$ -	\$ -	5
Landmark	\$ 139,954.47	\$ 78,374.50	\$ 57,082.32	\$ 16,528.92	\$ 4,763.26	3
Mid-Cities	\$ 509,410.91	\$ 288,589.44	\$ 208,115.23	\$ 65,176.12	\$ 15,298.08	19
Plano	\$ 143,836.66	\$ 80,548.53	\$ 31,988.24	\$ 38,354.26	\$ 10,206.03	5
Independence Health Group, Inc., including its subsidiaries Independence Blue Cross, Independence Administrators, and QCC Insurance Company	\$ 2,763,500.24	\$ 955,953.09	\$ 531,000.88	\$ 371,033.24	\$ 53,918.97	32
Beaumont	\$ 434,238.70	\$ 109,161.41	\$ 26,237.49	\$ 65,434.03	\$ 17,489.90	6
Craig Ranch	\$ 93,435.11	\$ 41,847.52	\$ 36,137.41	\$ 3,243.97	\$ 2,466.14	4
Innova / Southcross	\$ 1,582,285.18	\$ 514,315.23	\$ 245,448.86	\$ 255,384.78	\$ 13,481.59	6
Landmark	\$ 38,944.32	\$ 11,683.30	\$ 8,195.92	\$ 1,540.16	\$ 1,947.22	1
Mid-Cities	\$ 106,012.10	\$ 43,170.50	\$ 32,501.11	\$ 7,354.50	\$ 3,314.89	5
Plano	\$ 508,584.83	\$ 235,775.13	\$ 182,480.10	\$ 38,075.80	\$ 15,219.23	10
Lifetime Healthcare, Inc. d/b/a Excellus	\$ 354,759.71	\$ 106,427.91	\$ 51,238.45	\$ 48,122.15	\$ 7,067.31	8

BlueCross BlueShield						
Beaumont	\$ 26,571.19	\$ 7,971.36	\$ 3,359.54	\$ 3,283.26	\$ 1,328.56	1
Innova / Southcross	\$ 247,426.86	\$ 74,228.06	\$ 35,920.63	\$ 34,190.16	\$ 4,117.26	5
Mid-Cities	\$ 80,761.66	\$ 24,228.50	\$ 11,958.28	\$ 10,648.73	\$ 1,621.49	2
Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company d/b/a Blue Cross Blue Shield of Louisiana	\$ 10,333,493.42	\$ 4,008,050.67	\$ 3,060,461.20	\$ 762,309.47	\$ 185,279.99	126
Beaumont	\$ 2,346,443.42	\$ 880,591.42	\$ 668,975.01	\$ 146,018.03	\$ 65,598.38	51
Craig Ranch	\$ 214,082.99	\$ 84,319.86	\$ 61,318.67	\$ 11,284.09	\$ 11,717.11	6
East Houston	\$ 633,379.03	\$ 271,289.78	\$ 176,921.03	\$ 68,503.42	\$ 25,865.34	22
Innova / Southcross	\$ 3,943,222.22	\$ 1,378,216.59	\$ 1,123,331.94	\$ 244,636.49	\$ 10,248.16	17
Landmark	\$ 970,498.63	\$ 645,724.92	\$ 578,737.47	\$ 49,445.52	\$ 17,541.93	5
Mid-Cities	\$ 512,355.24	\$ 158,012.13	\$ 108,432.96	\$ 49,579.17	\$ -	4
Plano	\$ 1,713,511.89	\$ 589,895.97	\$ 342,744.14	\$ 192,842.75	\$ 54,309.08	21
Noridian Mutual Insurance Company d/b/a Blue Cross Blue Shield of North Dakota	\$ 64,480.40	\$ 29,502.56	\$ 16,998.84	\$ 12,048.00	\$ 455.72	4
Mid-Cities	\$ 11,129.18	\$ 3,338.75	\$ 1,685.62	\$ 1,653.13	\$ -	1
Plano	\$ 53,351.22	\$ 26,163.80	\$ 15,313.21	\$ 10,394.87	\$ 455.72	3
Premiera Blue Cross and Premiera Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Alaska	\$ 1,665,489.28	\$ 757,171.16	\$ 448,752.92	\$ 208,152.47	\$ 100,265.77	40
Beaumont	\$ 9,111.09	\$ 2,733.33	\$ 1,601.08	\$ 676.69	\$ 455.55	4
Craig Ranch	\$ 100,921.73	\$ 94,388.60	\$ 81,265.43	\$ 6,276.15	\$ 6,847.02	4
East Houston	\$ 36,083.19	\$ 10,824.96	\$ 1,975.18	\$ 7,114.42	\$ 1,735.36	1
Innova / Southcross	\$ 158,132.57	\$ 158,132.57	\$ 80,809.75	\$ 46,393.71	\$ 30,929.11	1
Landmark	\$ 212,105.52	\$ 63,631.66	\$ 51,258.19	\$ 8,901.58	\$ 3,471.89	1
Mid-Cities	\$ 416,545.10	\$ 124,963.53	\$ 52,855.59	\$ 53,128.15	\$ 18,979.79	13
Plano	\$ 732,590.08	\$ 302,496.52	\$ 178,987.71	\$ 85,661.77	\$ 37,847.04	16
Regence BlueCross BlueShield of Oregon	\$ 144,682.15	\$ 43,404.65	\$ 31,945.09	\$ 6,756.64	\$ 4,702.92	3
Beaumont	\$ 100,728.52	\$ 30,218.56	\$ 23,463.77	\$ 4,404.21	\$ 2,350.58	2
Landmark	\$ 43,953.63	\$ 13,186.09	\$ 8,481.32	\$ 2,352.43	\$ 2,352.34	1
Regence BlueCross BlueShield of Utah	\$ 319,291.97	\$ 127,642.12	\$ 87,781.79	\$ 33,977.75	\$ 5,882.58	10
Beaumont	\$ 3,243.24	\$ 972.97	\$ 810.81	\$ -	\$ 162.16	2
East Houston	\$ 10,569.98	\$ 3,170.99	\$ 2,741.55	\$ 112.34	\$ 317.10	1
Landmark	\$ 162,699.98	\$ 80,664.52	\$ 59,959.81	\$ 20,163.91	\$ 540.80	3

Mid-Cities	\$ 42,131.98	\$ 12,639.59	\$ 8,065.71	\$ 3,446.20	\$ 1,127.68	2
Plano	\$ 100,646.79	\$ 30,194.04	\$ 16,203.90	\$ 10,255.30	\$ 3,734.84	2
Regence BlueShield, also doing business as Regence Group Administrators	\$ 713,108.15	\$ 213,932.45	\$ 164,657.33	\$ 29,486.09	\$ 19,789.03	7
Innova / Southcross	\$ 685,229.18	\$ 205,568.75	\$ 160,249.62	\$ 27,191.67	\$ 18,127.46	4
Landmark	\$ 10,390.53	\$ 3,117.16	\$ 1,954.20	\$ 643.43	\$ 519.53	2
Plano	\$ 17,488.44	\$ 5,246.53	\$ 2,453.50	\$ 1,650.99	\$ 1,142.04	1
RightCHOICE Managed Care, Inc. d/b/a Anthem Blue Cross and Blue Shield Missouri d/b/a Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Missouri	\$ 843,738.91	\$ 385,815.27	\$ 283,549.13	\$ 69,935.74	\$ 32,330.40	12
Beaumont	\$ 245,773.19	\$ 188,391.41	\$ 149,581.06	\$ 22,416.59	\$ 16,393.76	5
East Houston	\$ 25,763.06	\$ 25,763.06	\$ 18,718.65	\$ 4,210.47	\$ 2,833.94	1
Landmark	\$ 282,399.87	\$ 84,719.96	\$ 67,594.11	\$ 11,477.85	\$ 5,648.00	1
Mid-Cities	\$ 172,389.43	\$ 51,716.83	\$ 16,769.84	\$ 29,065.88	\$ 5,881.11	3
Plano	\$ 117,413.36	\$ 35,224.01	\$ 30,885.46	\$ 2,764.95	\$ 1,573.60	2
Rocky Mountain Hospital and Medical Service, Inc. d/b/a Anthem Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Colorado and also d/b/a Anthem Health Insurance Company of Nevada or Anthem Blue Cross Blue Shield of Nevada	\$ 3,524,962.22	\$ 2,113,783.45	\$ 1,706,931.27	\$ 278,333.42	\$ 128,518.76	44
Beaumont	\$ 175,770.90	\$ 80,739.16	\$ 63,149.29	\$ 7,932.08	\$ 9,657.79	7
Craig Ranch	\$ 181,025.36	\$ 140,483.92	\$ 98,971.24	\$ 21,377.90	\$ 20,134.78	10
East Houston	\$ 68,844.28	\$ 54,824.72	\$ 45,895.82	\$ 5,261.09	\$ 3,667.81	4
Innova / Southcross	\$ 842,884.61	\$ 511,371.61	\$ 383,523.73	\$ 89,305.04	\$ 38,542.84	4
Landmark	\$ 1,644,780.53	\$ 1,053,844.88	\$ 955,406.41	\$ 72,220.69	\$ 26,217.78	9
Mid-Cities	\$ 492,250.00	\$ 231,240.70	\$ 138,950.95	\$ 68,445.54	\$ 23,844.21	6
Plano	\$ 119,406.54	\$ 41,278.47	\$ 21,033.82	\$ 13,791.08	\$ 6,453.57	4
Wellmark, Inc. d/b/a Wellmark Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Iowa d/b/a Blue Cross	\$ 584,896.93	\$ 187,897.07	\$ 138,996.47	\$ 40,050.04	\$ 8,850.56	16

and Blue Shield of Iowa						
Beaumont	\$ 14,000.11	\$ 4,200.03	\$ 2,763.83	\$ 1,148.96	\$ 287.24	1
East Houston	\$ 24,389.27	\$ 24,389.27	\$ 17,412.19	\$ 6,489.29	\$ 487.79	1
Landmark	\$ 251,023.21	\$ 75,306.96	\$ 56,138.75	\$ 14,147.75	\$ 5,020.46	1
Mid-Cities	\$ 25,280.81	\$ 7,584.24	\$ 5,360.70	\$ 2,119.21	\$ 104.33	2
Plano	\$ 270,203.53	\$ 76,416.56	\$ 57,320.99	\$ 16,144.83	\$ 2,950.74	11
Grand Total	\$116,376,352.79	\$59,988,447.59	\$43,162,553.66	\$12,481,839.08	\$4,340,774.01	1896

SCHEDULE 2

Entity Name	Claim Billed Amount	Expected Reimbursement	Calculated Amount Due	TTL Insurance Payment	Estimated Patient Responsibility	# of Accts
Anthem Blue Cross Life and Health Insurance Company, also known as Blue Cross Blue Shield of California	\$ 4,521,350.46	\$ 3,032,388.49	\$ 2,213,814.19	\$ 590,840.99	\$ 227,733.32	99
R&C	\$ 3,698,652.60	\$ 2,209,690.63	\$ 1,575,934.04	\$ 469,027.11	\$ 164,729.48	82
Beaumont	\$ 361,083.40	\$ 216,650.04	\$ 167,987.82	\$ 36,614.43	\$ 12,047.79	10
Craig Ranch	\$ 1,319,839.26	\$ 783,731.10	\$ 493,257.30	\$ 222,160.71	\$ 68,313.09	25
East Houston	\$ 33,211.76	\$ 18,598.59	\$ 15,039.89	\$ 1,380.83	\$ 2,177.87	1
Innova / Southcross	\$ 215,182.29	\$ 129,109.37	\$ 109,284.55	\$ 8,689.35	\$ 11,135.47	4
Landmark	\$ 128,046.73	\$ 76,828.04	\$ 59,527.38	\$ 12,584.51	\$ 4,716.15	3
Mid-Cities	\$ 687,687.66	\$ 412,612.60	\$ 301,914.16	\$ 85,001.60	\$ 25,696.84	13
Plano	\$ 953,601.50	\$ 572,160.90	\$ 428,922.95	\$ 102,595.68	\$ 40,642.27	26
U&C	\$ 822,697.86	\$ 822,697.86	\$ 637,880.14	\$ 121,813.88	\$ 63,003.84	17
Craig Ranch	\$ 197,669.57	\$ 197,669.57	\$ 165,136.36	\$ 28,489.62	\$ 4,043.59	3
Innova / Southcross	\$ 15,948.29	\$ 15,948.29	\$ 13,243.74	\$ 1,372.88	\$ 1,331.67	1
Landmark	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 2,915.02	\$ 651.02	\$ 433.96	2
Mid-Cities	\$ 397,546.44	\$ 397,546.44	\$ 303,662.36	\$ 62,687.78	\$ 31,196.30	6
Plano	\$ 207,533.56	\$ 207,533.56	\$ 152,922.66	\$ 28,612.58	\$ 25,998.32	5
Anthem Health Plans of Kentucky, Inc.	\$ 1,428,855.56	\$ 1,085,184.06	\$ 833,007.46	\$ 181,493.31	\$ 70,683.29	17
R&C	\$ 751,969.26	\$ 408,297.76	\$ 299,005.44	\$ 56,796.51	\$ 52,495.81	5
Innova / Southcross	\$ 249,721.46	\$ 134,849.59	\$ 106,076.10	\$ 26,035.34	\$ 2,738.15	2
Landmark	\$ 427,769.14	\$ 230,995.34	\$ 162,788.86	\$ 24,093.70	\$ 44,112.77	2
Mid-Cities	\$ 74,478.66	\$ 42,452.84	\$ 30,140.48	\$ 6,667.47	\$ 5,644.89	1
U&C	\$ 676,886.30	\$ 676,886.30	\$ 534,002.02	\$ 124,696.80	\$ 18,187.48	12
East Houston	\$ 28,738.14	\$ 28,738.14	\$ 21,541.13	\$ 1,310.10	\$ 5,886.91	1
Innova / Southcross	\$ 85,515.29	\$ 85,515.29	\$ 72,484.16	\$ 8,779.45	\$ 4,251.68	3
Landmark	\$ 533,757.72	\$ 533,757.72	\$ 414,648.79	\$ 113,108.93	\$ 6,000.00	6
Mid-Cities	\$ 28,875.15	\$ 28,875.15	\$ 25,327.94	\$ 1,498.32	\$ 2,048.89	2

Anthem Health Plans of Virginia, Inc. d/b/a Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Virginia and/or Anthem Blue Cross Blue Shield of Virginia						
	\$ 1,977,289.91	\$ 1,359,348.05	\$ 965,304.41	\$ 327,678.38	\$ 66,365.26	24
R&C	\$ 1,347,567.77	\$ 729,625.91	\$ 425,927.63	\$ 254,158.51	\$ 49,539.76	16
Beaumont	\$ 196,909.77	\$ 111,339.50	\$ 71,038.79	\$ 21,515.05	\$ 18,785.66	7
Craig Ranch	\$ 35,027.89	\$ 16,813.39	\$ 11,184.99	\$ 3,135.06	\$ 2,493.34	3
East Houston	\$ 10,430.47	\$ 5,632.45	\$ 3,457.35	\$ 1,172.60	\$ 1,002.50	1
Innova / Southcross	\$ 816,809.24	\$ 457,413.17	\$ 298,715.25	\$ 152,256.66	\$ 6,441.26	2
Mid-Cities	\$ 288,390.40	\$ 138,427.39	\$ 41,531.25	\$ 76,079.14	\$ 20,817.00	3
U&C	\$ 629,722.14	\$ 629,722.14	\$ 539,376.77	\$ 73,519.87	\$ 16,825.50	8
Beaumont	\$ 24,664.27	\$ 24,664.27	\$ 22,434.27	\$ 660.97	\$ 1,569.03	1
Craig Ranch	\$ 24,872.78	\$ 24,872.78	\$ 17,443.28	\$ 3,060.96	\$ 4,368.54	2
Innova / Southcross	\$ 56,479.59	\$ 56,479.59	\$ 48,747.33	\$ 4,339.37	\$ 3,392.89	1
Landmark	\$ 491,140.05	\$ 491,140.05	\$ 427,516.59	\$ 61,564.25	\$ 2,059.21	2
Mid-Cities	\$ 18,498.56	\$ 18,498.56	\$ 13,663.40	\$ 2,396.83	\$ 2,438.33	1
Plano	\$ 14,066.89	\$ 14,066.89	\$ 9,571.90	\$ 1,497.49	\$ 2,997.50	1
Anthem Health Plans, Inc. d/b/a Anthem Blue Cross and Blue Shield Connecticut						
	\$ 296,860.48	\$ 237,791.11	\$ 161,965.05	\$ 49,151.39	\$ 26,674.67	9
R&C	\$ 131,685.74	\$ 72,616.37	\$ 44,552.79	\$ 19,238.79	\$ 8,824.79	3
Landmark	\$ 41,646.64	\$ 22,489.19	\$ 12,279.87	\$ 5,628.19	\$ 4,581.13	1
Plano	\$ 90,039.10	\$ 50,127.19	\$ 32,272.93	\$ 13,610.60	\$ 4,243.66	2
U&C	\$ 165,174.74	\$ 165,174.74	\$ 117,412.26	\$ 29,912.60	\$ 17,849.88	6
Beaumont	\$ 9,921.83	\$ 9,921.83	\$ 7,059.44	\$ 1,431.18	\$ 1,431.21	1
Craig Ranch	\$ 17,836.24	\$ 17,836.24	\$ 9,459.99	\$ 5,080.30	\$ 3,295.95	1
Plano	\$ 137,416.67	\$ 137,416.67	\$ 100,892.83	\$ 23,401.12	\$ 13,122.72	4
Anthem Insurance Companies, Inc. also d/b/a Blue Cross Blue Shield of Indiana						
	\$ 11,515,879.72	\$ 9,730,340.17	\$ 7,566,645.30	\$ 1,647,425.37	\$ 512,988.66	145
R&C	\$ 3,960,596.21	\$ 2,175,056.66	\$ 1,536,976.57	\$ 443,980.67	\$ 194,099.41	57
Beaumont	\$ 68,776.30	\$ 37,139.20	\$ 17,882.14	\$ 8,142.22	\$ 11,114.84	3
Craig Ranch	\$ 101,500.37	\$ 65,079.26	\$ 46,592.47	\$ 8,801.98	\$ 9,684.80	4
East Houston	\$ 10,396.20	\$ 5,821.87	\$ 3,329.46	\$ 2,197.33	\$ 295.08	1
Innova / Southcross	\$ 1,832,326.21	\$ 989,456.15	\$ 782,185.47	\$ 174,178.33	\$ 33,092.35	11

Landmark	\$ 785,675.20	\$ 428,310.80	\$ 289,711.74	\$ 60,009.94	\$ 78,589.12	8
Mid-Cities	\$ 461,777.73	\$ 264,223.58	\$ 155,636.16	\$ 83,390.07	\$ 25,197.35	11
Plano	\$ 700,144.20	\$ 385,025.79	\$ 241,639.12	\$ 107,260.80	\$ 36,125.87	19
U&C	\$ 7,555,283.51	\$ 7,555,283.51	\$ 6,029,668.73	\$ 1,203,444.70	\$ 318,889.24	88
Beaumont	\$ 800,625.74	\$ 800,625.74	\$ 612,271.16	\$ 112,190.64	\$ 76,163.94	12
Craig Ranch	\$ 276,021.34	\$ 276,021.34	\$ 184,794.22	\$ 53,714.95	\$ 37,512.17	7
East Houston	\$ 27,630.07	\$ 27,630.07	\$ 20,417.93	\$ 4,172.83	\$ 3,039.31	1
Innova / Southcross	\$ 1,247,050.88	\$ 1,247,050.88	\$ 1,099,878.39	\$ 120,758.30	\$ 26,414.19	14
Landmark	\$ 3,394,027.72	\$ 3,394,027.72	\$ 2,733,672.21	\$ 597,943.84	\$ 62,411.67	20
Mid-Cities	\$ 553,644.33	\$ 553,644.33	\$ 405,077.38	\$ 99,457.56	\$ 49,109.39	16
Plano	\$ 1,256,283.43	\$ 1,256,283.43	\$ 973,557.44	\$ 215,206.58	\$ 64,238.57	18
Arkansas Blue Cross and Blue Shield	\$ 167,903.74	\$ 139,233.44	\$ 102,526.31	\$ 23,562.23	\$ 13,144.90	4
R&C	\$ 102,393.93	\$ 73,723.63	\$ 52,991.71	\$ 14,098.57	\$ 6,633.35	2
Mid-Cities	\$ 60,440.70	\$ 43,517.30	\$ 34,609.63	\$ 5,344.66	\$ 3,563.01	1
Plano	\$ 41,953.23	\$ 30,206.33	\$ 18,382.08	\$ 8,753.91	\$ 3,070.34	1
U&C	\$ 65,509.81	\$ 65,509.81	\$ 49,534.60	\$ 9,463.66	\$ 6,511.55	2
Plano	\$ 65,509.81	\$ 65,509.81	\$ 49,534.60	\$ 9,463.66	\$ 6,511.55	2
BCBSM, Inc. d/b/a Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Minnesota	\$ 594,791.19	\$ 421,468.76	\$ 344,218.72	\$ 64,340.38	\$ 12,909.66	13
R&C	\$ 393,914.61	\$ 220,592.18	\$ 166,747.04	\$ 44,310.83	\$ 9,534.31	9
Beaumont	\$ 85,287.69	\$ 47,761.11	\$ 43,271.72	\$ 2,693.79	\$ 1,795.60	1
Craig Ranch	\$ 15,111.45	\$ 8,462.41	\$ 7,315.02	\$ -	\$ 1,147.39	1
East Houston	\$ 15,144.87	\$ 8,481.13	\$ 8,481.13	\$ -	\$ -	1
Innova / Southcross	\$ 27,279.43	\$ 15,276.48	\$ 8,185.04	\$ 4,837.44	\$ 2,254.00	2
Landmark	\$ 22,084.32	\$ 12,367.22	\$ 6,337.89	\$ 2,821.16	\$ 3,208.17	2
Plano	\$ 229,006.85	\$ 128,243.84	\$ 93,156.25	\$ 33,958.44	\$ 1,129.15	2
U&C	\$ 200,876.58	\$ 200,876.58	\$ 177,471.68	\$ 20,029.55	\$ 3,375.35	4
Beaumont	\$ 120,592.89	\$ 120,592.89	\$ 103,127.70	\$ 16,636.35	\$ 828.84	2
Craig Ranch	\$ 46,897.00	\$ 46,897.00	\$ 43,589.33	\$ 1,900.76	\$ 1,406.91	1
Mid-Cities	\$ 33,386.69	\$ 33,386.69	\$ 30,754.65	\$ 1,492.44	\$ 1,139.60	1
Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Mississippi, a Mutual Insurance Company	\$ 52,165.64	\$ 29,212.76	\$ 21,217.92	\$ 7,644.95	\$ 349.89	1
R&C	\$ 52,165.64	\$ 29,212.76	\$ 21,217.92	\$ 7,644.95	\$ 349.89	1
Craig Ranch	\$ 52,165.64	\$ 29,212.76	\$ 21,217.92	\$ 7,644.95	\$ 349.89	1

Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Rhode Island						
	\$ 30,226.13	\$ 30,226.13	\$ 28,300.11	\$ 1,140.89	\$ 785.13	2
U&C	\$ 30,226.13	\$ 30,226.13	\$ 28,300.11	\$ 1,140.89	\$ 785.13	2
Craig Ranch	\$ 15,161.95	\$ 15,161.95	\$ 13,940.54	\$ 577.14	\$ 644.27	1
Innova / Southcross	\$ 15,064.18	\$ 15,064.18	\$ 14,359.57	\$ 563.75	\$ 140.86	1
Blue Cross and Blue Shield Healthcare Plan of Georgia						
	\$ 160,201.52	\$ 149,253.85	\$ 107,119.96	\$ 23,523.62	\$ 18,610.27	5
R&C	\$ 42,106.43	\$ 31,158.76	\$ 13,215.51	\$ 10,766.01	\$ 7,177.24	1
Plano	\$ 42,106.43	\$ 31,158.76	\$ 13,215.51	\$ 10,766.01	\$ 7,177.24	1
U&C	\$ 118,095.09	\$ 118,095.09	\$ 93,904.45	\$ 12,757.61	\$ 11,433.03	4
Craig Ranch	\$ 13,740.87	\$ 13,740.87	\$ 12,532.60	\$ 724.99	\$ 483.28	1
Mid-Cities	\$ 39,850.95	\$ 39,850.95	\$ 34,724.94	\$ 788.28	\$ 4,337.73	1
Plano	\$ 64,503.27	\$ 64,503.27	\$ 46,646.91	\$ 11,244.34	\$ 6,612.02	2
Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Alabama						
	\$ 2,103,424.39	\$ 2,034,590.51	\$ 1,702,500.52	\$ 239,357.38	\$ 92,732.60	35
R&C	\$ 156,440.64	\$ 87,606.76	\$ 44,017.80	\$ 31,068.47	\$ 12,520.49	4
Craig Ranch	\$ 51,533.25	\$ 28,858.62	\$ 23,031.90	\$ 2,752.42	\$ 3,074.30	2
Mid-Cities	\$ 29,411.24	\$ 16,470.29	\$ 7,001.44	\$ 5,681.34	\$ 3,787.51	1
Plano	\$ 75,496.15	\$ 42,277.84	\$ 13,984.45	\$ 22,634.71	\$ 5,658.68	1
U&C	\$ 1,946,983.75	\$ 1,946,983.75	\$ 1,658,482.73	\$ 208,288.91	\$ 80,212.11	31
Beaumont	\$ 194,858.47	\$ 194,858.47	\$ 170,772.97	\$ 15,668.26	\$ 8,417.24	6
Craig Ranch	\$ 537,523.67	\$ 537,523.67	\$ 428,557.12	\$ 79,638.94	\$ 29,327.61	11
East Houston	\$ 61,716.32	\$ 61,716.32	\$ 53,783.65	\$ 2,289.68	\$ 5,642.99	2
Innova / Southcross	\$ 55,475.10	\$ 55,475.10	\$ 46,890.42	\$ 4,550.81	\$ 4,033.87	1
Landmark	\$ 426,546.95	\$ 426,546.95	\$ 388,520.88	\$ 35,195.33	\$ 2,830.74	3
Mid-Cities	\$ 556,585.05	\$ 556,585.05	\$ 474,955.85	\$ 61,329.26	\$ 20,299.94	4
Plano	\$ 114,278.19	\$ 114,278.19	\$ 95,001.84	\$ 9,616.63	\$ 9,659.72	4
Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Florida, Inc. d/b/a Florida Blue						
	\$ 233,193.70	\$ 200,433.61	\$ 171,182.32	\$ 11,926.80	\$ 17,324.49	9
R&C	\$ 74,454.76	\$ 41,694.67	\$ 31,875.59	\$ 2,677.62	\$ 7,141.46	2
Beaumont	\$ 19,886.57	\$ 11,136.48	\$ 9,474.42	\$ 1,349.14	\$ 312.92	1
Plano	\$ 54,568.19	\$ 30,558.19	\$ 22,401.17	\$ 1,328.48	\$ 6,828.54	1
U&C	\$ 158,738.94	\$ 158,738.94	\$ 139,306.73	\$ 9,249.18	\$ 10,183.03	7
Beaumont	\$ 42,852.59	\$ 42,852.59	\$ 36,364.21	\$ 5,273.54	\$ 1,214.84	2
Craig Ranch	\$ 46,027.53	\$ 46,027.53	\$ 43,038.56	\$ 2,771.26	\$ 217.71	2

Landmark	\$ 14,400.40	\$ 14,400.40	\$ 13,444.20	\$ -	\$ 956.20	1
Plano	\$ 55,458.42	\$ 55,458.42	\$ 46,459.76	\$ 1,204.38	\$ 7,794.28	2
Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Georgia, Inc.						
	\$ 4,437,557.27	\$ 4,070,413.42	\$ 3,238,355.25	\$ 679,065.47	\$ 152,992.70	48
R&C	\$ 982,259.71	\$ 615,115.86	\$ 434,613.66	\$ 129,844.23	\$ 50,657.97	20
Beaumont	\$ 292,332.56	\$ 158,603.94	\$ 91,851.35	\$ 48,030.26	\$ 18,722.34	6
Craig Ranch	\$ 75,777.35	\$ 56,075.24	\$ 38,687.36	\$ 9,146.41	\$ 8,241.47	3
East Houston	\$ 68,034.25	\$ 36,738.50	\$ 29,916.36	\$ 4,464.87	\$ 2,357.26	2
Innova / Southcross	\$ 38,175.31	\$ 20,614.67	\$ 13,741.51	\$ 4,666.09	\$ 2,207.07	1
Landmark	\$ 134,838.70	\$ 73,448.99	\$ 34,143.07	\$ 32,256.84	\$ 7,049.08	3
Mid-Cities	\$ 93,677.89	\$ 62,861.03	\$ 34,764.23	\$ 22,911.36	\$ 5,185.44	2
Plano	\$ 279,423.65	\$ 206,773.50	\$ 191,509.79	\$ 8,368.40	\$ 6,895.31	3
U&C	\$ 3,455,297.56	\$ 3,455,297.56	\$ 2,803,741.59	\$ 549,221.24	\$ 102,334.73	28
Beaumont	\$ 193,933.84	\$ 193,933.84	\$ 158,178.57	\$ 21,908.97	\$ 13,846.30	7
Craig Ranch	\$ 111,910.43	\$ 111,910.43	\$ 85,259.86	\$ 18,426.32	\$ 8,224.25	2
East Houston	\$ 70,274.60	\$ 70,274.60	\$ 62,939.42	\$ 5,226.94	\$ 2,108.24	1
Innova / Southcross	\$ 2,496,734.66	\$ 2,496,734.66	\$ 2,009,747.74	\$ 453,256.78	\$ 33,730.14	7
Landmark	\$ 52,957.75	\$ 52,957.75	\$ 36,626.83	\$ 8,690.09	\$ 7,640.83	2
Mid-Cities	\$ 299,502.36	\$ 299,502.36	\$ 270,534.09	\$ 15,775.61	\$ 13,192.66	5
Plano	\$ 229,983.92	\$ 229,983.92	\$ 180,455.08	\$ 25,936.53	\$ 23,592.31	4
Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas City						
	\$ 707,224.44	\$ 549,335.19	\$ 407,572.85	\$ 121,325.71	\$ 20,436.63	8
R&C	\$ 358,839.21	\$ 200,949.96	\$ 130,554.71	\$ 54,848.58	\$ 15,546.67	4
Craig Ranch	\$ 23,990.92	\$ 13,434.92	\$ 11,369.06	\$ 9.29	\$ 2,056.57	1
Mid-Cities	\$ 109,853.81	\$ 61,518.13	\$ 30,859.45	\$ 25,165.99	\$ 5,492.69	1
Plano	\$ 224,994.48	\$ 125,996.91	\$ 88,326.20	\$ 29,673.30	\$ 7,997.41	2
U&C	\$ 348,385.23	\$ 348,385.23	\$ 277,018.14	\$ 66,477.13	\$ 4,889.96	4
Craig Ranch	\$ 69,106.12	\$ 69,106.12	\$ 60,532.47	\$ 7,226.44	\$ 1,347.21	2
East Houston	\$ 10,574.38	\$ 10,574.38	\$ 9,017.70	\$ 934.04	\$ 622.64	1
Plano	\$ 268,704.73	\$ 268,704.73	\$ 207,467.97	\$ 58,316.65	\$ 2,920.11	1
Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Massachusetts, Inc also doing business as Blue Benefit Administrators						
	\$ 1,175,935.30	\$ 1,110,111.84	\$ 1,007,880.04	\$ 74,639.57	\$ 27,592.23	29
R&C	\$ 149,598.77	\$ 83,775.31	\$ 78,872.85	\$ 1,124.77	\$ 3,777.69	8
Beaumont	\$ 31,674.08	\$ 17,737.48	\$ 17,737.48	\$ -	\$ -	1
Craig Ranch	\$ 19,140.88	\$ 10,718.89	\$ 10,286.95	\$ -	\$ 431.94	1

Mid-Cities	\$ 47,730.60	\$ 26,729.14	\$ 26,729.14	\$ -	\$ -	3
Plano	\$ 51,053.21	\$ 28,589.80	\$ 24,119.28	\$ 1,124.77	\$ 3,345.75	3
U&C	\$ 1,026,336.53	\$ 1,026,336.53	\$ 929,007.19	\$ 73,514.80	\$ 23,814.54	21
Beaumont	\$ 62,449.72	\$ 62,449.72	\$ 51,180.51	\$ 3,675.76	\$ 7,593.45	2
Craig Ranch	\$ 309,875.34	\$ 309,875.34	\$ 286,520.45	\$ 17,672.30	\$ 5,682.59	6
East Houston	\$ 46,261.03	\$ 46,261.03	\$ 46,261.03	\$ -	\$ -	2
Innova / Southcross	\$ 15,870.20	\$ 15,870.20	\$ 15,870.20	\$ -	\$ -	1
Landmark	\$ 80,172.26	\$ 80,172.26	\$ 80,172.26	\$ -	\$ -	1
Mid-Cities	\$ 114,509.40	\$ 114,509.40	\$ 99,458.17	\$ 12,430.66	\$ 2,620.57	3
Plano	\$ 397,198.58	\$ 397,198.58	\$ 349,544.57	\$ 39,736.08	\$ 7,917.93	6
Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Nebraska						
	\$ 399,688.02	\$ 296,148.10	\$ 226,094.44	\$ 49,333.11	\$ 20,720.55	12
R&C	\$ 235,318.00	\$ 131,778.08	\$ 92,718.30	\$ 32,039.84	\$ 7,019.94	5
Craig Ranch	\$ 58,906.27	\$ 32,987.51	\$ 22,674.07	\$ 10,313.44	\$ -	1
Plano	\$ 176,411.73	\$ 98,790.57	\$ 70,044.23	\$ 21,726.40	\$ 7,019.94	4
U&C	\$ 164,370.02	\$ 164,370.02	\$ 133,376.14	\$ 17,293.27	\$ 13,700.61	7
Beaumont	\$ 33,747.32	\$ 33,747.32	\$ 31,366.96	\$ 1,288.10	\$ 1,092.26	2
East Houston	\$ 47,638.80	\$ 47,638.80	\$ 40,879.84	\$ 4,377.02	\$ 2,381.94	1
Innova / Southcross	\$ 25,618.35	\$ 25,618.35	\$ 14,329.84	\$ 5,573.10	\$ 5,715.41	1
Plano	\$ 57,365.55	\$ 57,365.55	\$ 46,799.50	\$ 6,055.05	\$ 4,511.00	3
Blue Cross and Blue Shield of North Carolina						
	\$ 896,211.21	\$ 879,493.41	\$ 756,503.67	\$ 64,047.99	\$ 58,941.76	14
R&C	\$ 37,994.99	\$ 21,277.19	\$ 11,308.83	\$ 5,042.60	\$ 4,925.76	1
Plano	\$ 37,994.99	\$ 21,277.19	\$ 11,308.83	\$ 5,042.60	\$ 4,925.76	1
U&C	\$ 858,216.22	\$ 858,216.22	\$ 745,194.83	\$ 59,005.39	\$ 54,016.00	13
Beaumont	\$ 139,358.36	\$ 139,358.36	\$ 123,886.05	\$ 5,941.03	\$ 9,531.28	4
Craig Ranch	\$ 191,119.84	\$ 191,119.84	\$ 148,627.83	\$ 23,547.86	\$ 18,944.15	2
Landmark	\$ 421,406.29	\$ 421,406.29	\$ 387,488.14	\$ 20,385.87	\$ 13,532.28	3
Plano	\$ 106,331.73	\$ 106,331.73	\$ 85,192.81	\$ 9,130.63	\$ 12,008.29	4
Blue Cross and Blue Shield of South Carolina						
	\$ 156,684.44	\$ 137,356.90	\$ 97,020.39	\$ 16,993.70	\$ 23,342.81	6
R&C	\$ 43,926.23	\$ 24,598.69	\$ 17,667.56	\$ 2,621.35	\$ 4,309.78	2
Craig Ranch	\$ 43,926.23	\$ 24,598.69	\$ 17,667.56	\$ 2,621.35	\$ 4,309.78	2
U&C	\$ 112,758.21	\$ 112,758.21	\$ 79,352.83	\$ 14,372.35	\$ 19,033.03	4
Craig Ranch	\$ 20,076.52	\$ 20,076.52	\$ 16,725.84	\$ -	\$ 3,350.68	1

Innova / Southcross	\$ 21,530.12	\$ 21,530.12	\$ 8,827.35	\$ 6,276.41	\$ 6,426.36	1
Landmark	\$ 16,646.48	\$ 16,646.48	\$ 6,825.06	\$ 3,835.74	\$ 5,985.68	1
Mid-Cities	\$ 54,505.09	\$ 54,505.09	\$ 46,974.58	\$ 4,260.20	\$ 3,270.31	1
Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan	\$ 106,127.98	\$ 106,127.98	\$ 96,532.35	\$ 7,166.76	\$ 2,428.87	2
U&C	\$ 106,127.98	\$ 106,127.98	\$ 96,532.35	\$ 7,166.76	\$ 2,428.87	2
Landmark	\$ 25,110.05	\$ 25,110.05	\$ 25,110.05	\$ -	\$ -	1
Plano	\$ 81,017.93	\$ 81,017.93	\$ 71,422.30	\$ 7,166.76	\$ 2,428.87	1
Blue Cross Blue Shield of Wisconsin d/b/a Anthem Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Wisconsin	\$ 245,277.14	\$ 245,277.14	\$ 190,408.56	\$ 47,244.42	\$ 7,624.16	5
U&C	\$ 245,277.14	\$ 245,277.14	\$ 190,408.56	\$ 47,244.42	\$ 7,624.16	5
Craig Ranch	\$ 201,493.86	\$ 201,493.86	\$ 156,513.38	\$ 41,195.74	\$ 3,784.74	2
Mid-Cities	\$ 43,783.28	\$ 43,783.28	\$ 33,895.18	\$ 6,048.68	\$ 3,839.42	3
Blue Cross of California d/b/a Anthem Blue Cross	\$ 52,139.11	\$ 31,283.47	\$ 26,197.48	\$ 2,257.96	\$ 2,828.03	2
R&C	\$ 52,139.11	\$ 31,283.47	\$ 26,197.48	\$ 2,257.96	\$ 2,828.03	2
Plano	\$ 52,139.11	\$ 31,283.47	\$ 26,197.48	\$ 2,257.96	\$ 2,828.03	2
BlueAdvantage Administrators of Arkansas	\$ 354,903.08	\$ 261,087.71	\$ 203,234.99	\$ 25,619.14	\$ 32,233.59	6
R&C	\$ 291,926.56	\$ 198,111.19	\$ 147,902.06	\$ 23,997.86	\$ 26,211.28	3
Craig Ranch	\$ 212,287.25	\$ 140,770.89	\$ 103,494.47	\$ 19,825.47	\$ 17,450.95	2
Landmark	\$ 79,639.31	\$ 57,340.30	\$ 44,407.59	\$ 4,172.39	\$ 8,760.32	1
U&C	\$ 62,976.52	\$ 62,976.52	\$ 55,332.93	\$ 1,621.28	\$ 6,022.31	3
East Houston	\$ 45,868.44	\$ 45,868.44	\$ 40,178.45	\$ 644.46	\$ 5,045.53	2
Mid-Cities	\$ 17,108.08	\$ 17,108.08	\$ 15,154.48	\$ 976.82	\$ 976.78	1
BlueCross BlueShield of Tennessee, Inc.	\$ 3,994,437.84	\$ 3,848,892.15	\$ 3,188,022.21	\$ 537,256.71	\$ 123,613.24	40
R&C	\$ 330,785.65	\$ 185,239.96	\$ 131,180.37	\$ 31,404.75	\$ 22,654.85	10
Beaumont	\$ 32,213.89	\$ 18,039.78	\$ 13,671.57	\$ 3,079.65	\$ 1,288.56	1
Craig Ranch	\$ 58,839.76	\$ 32,950.27	\$ 23,565.21	\$ 7,811.99	\$ 1,573.07	1
East Houston	\$ 16,317.75	\$ 9,137.94	\$ 9,115.07	\$ -	\$ 22.87	1
Innova / Southcross	\$ 52,579.23	\$ 29,444.37	\$ 18,511.16	\$ 4,878.76	\$ 6,054.45	2
Landmark	\$ 36,354.55	\$ 20,358.55	\$ 15,724.15	\$ 3,180.22	\$ 1,454.18	1
Mid-Cities	\$ 87,736.10	\$ 49,132.22	\$ 35,452.08	\$ 7,152.65	\$ 6,527.49	3

Plano	\$ 46,744.37	\$ 26,176.85	\$ 15,141.14	\$ 5,301.48	\$ 5,734.23	1
U&C	\$ 3,663,652.19	\$ 3,663,652.19	\$ 3,056,841.84	\$ 505,851.96	\$ 100,958.39	30
Beaumont	\$ 563,055.85	\$ 563,055.85	\$ 486,316.81	\$ 49,981.73	\$ 26,757.31	10
Craig Ranch	\$ 118,913.89	\$ 118,913.89	\$ 100,597.67	\$ 9,762.32	\$ 8,553.90	2
East Houston	\$ 14,931.36	\$ 14,931.36	\$ 13,975.13	\$ -	\$ 956.23	1
Innova / Southcross	\$ 2,026,468.46	\$ 2,026,468.46	\$ 1,625,781.90	\$ 389,187.67	\$ 11,498.89	2
Landmark	\$ 581,724.95	\$ 581,724.95	\$ 540,061.58	\$ 19,063.04	\$ 22,600.33	4
Mid-Cities	\$ 107,637.90	\$ 107,637.90	\$ 91,883.45	\$ 10,098.85	\$ 5,655.60	3
Plano	\$ 250,919.78	\$ 250,919.78	\$ 198,225.30	\$ 27,758.35	\$ 24,936.13	8
California Physicians' Service, previously identified as Blue Shield of California Life & Health Insurance Company d/b/a Blue Shield of California						
	\$ 810,377.49	\$ 680,462.75	\$ 653,864.60	\$ 19,119.29	\$ 7,478.86	15
R&C	\$ 324,786.85	\$ 194,872.11	\$ 189,303.36	\$ 3,022.48	\$ 2,546.27	7
Craig Ranch	\$ 47,038.98	\$ 28,223.39	\$ 25,504.64	\$ 1,402.48	\$ 1,316.27	1
Mid-Cities	\$ 195,178.50	\$ 117,107.10	\$ 114,957.10	\$ 1,410.00	\$ 740.00	4
Plano	\$ 82,569.37	\$ 49,541.62	\$ 48,841.62	\$ 210.00	\$ 490.00	2
U&C	\$ 485,590.64	\$ 485,590.64	\$ 464,561.24	\$ 16,096.81	\$ 4,932.59	8
Craig Ranch	\$ 97,829.49	\$ 97,829.49	\$ 87,824.86	\$ 9,544.40	\$ 460.23	3
Mid-Cities	\$ 32,473.10	\$ 32,473.10	\$ 31,889.77	\$ 350.00	\$ 233.33	1
Plano	\$ 355,288.05	\$ 355,288.05	\$ 344,846.61	\$ 6,202.41	\$ 4,239.03	4
Capital BlueCross also known as Capital Blue Cross Blue Shield and Capital Hospital Service						
	\$ 226,663.04	\$ 164,033.88	\$ 139,637.09	\$ 21,228.82	\$ 3,167.97	6
R&C	\$ 142,339.00	\$ 79,709.84	\$ 60,006.27	\$ 19,703.57	\$ -	1
Beaumont	\$ 142,339.00	\$ 79,709.84	\$ 60,006.27	\$ 19,703.57	\$ -	1
U&C	\$ 84,324.04	\$ 84,324.04	\$ 79,630.82	\$ 1,525.25	\$ 3,167.97	5
Beaumont	\$ 18,808.20	\$ 18,808.20	\$ 17,830.49	\$ 477.71	\$ 500.00	1
Craig Ranch	\$ 19,661.82	\$ 19,661.82	\$ 18,015.77	\$ 146.05	\$ 1,500.00	1
Innova / Southcross	\$ 31,483.28	\$ 31,483.28	\$ 30,319.09	\$ 696.22	\$ 467.97	2
Plano	\$ 14,370.74	\$ 14,370.74	\$ 13,465.47	\$ 205.27	\$ 700.00	1

Community Insurance Company d/b/a Anthem Blue Cross of Ohio and/or Blue Cross Blue Shield of Ohio						
	\$ 2,364,585.25	\$ 1,732,785.87	\$ 1,220,930.46	\$ 356,611.31	\$ 155,244.09	51
R&C	\$ 1,387,066.81	\$ 755,267.43	\$ 524,559.49	\$ 189,527.53	\$ 41,180.41	16
Beaumont	\$ 29,028.92	\$ 15,675.62	\$ 11,757.87	\$ 3,046.88	\$ 870.87	1
Craig Ranch	\$ 390,945.11	\$ 217,066.50	\$ 151,721.31	\$ 57,308.16	\$ 8,037.03	4
East Houston	\$ 34,751.69	\$ 18,765.91	\$ 13,053.46	\$ 4,669.90	\$ 1,042.55	2
Innova / Southcross	\$ 257,535.25	\$ 139,069.04	\$ 95,503.68	\$ 31,955.06	\$ 11,610.30	3
Mid-Cities	\$ 582,367.30	\$ 314,478.34	\$ 217,800.66	\$ 84,189.17	\$ 12,488.51	3
Plano	\$ 92,438.54	\$ 50,212.02	\$ 34,722.51	\$ 8,358.36	\$ 7,131.15	3
U&C	\$ 977,518.44	\$ 977,518.44	\$ 696,370.98	\$ 167,083.78	\$ 114,063.68	35
Beaumont	\$ 154,054.97	\$ 154,054.97	\$ 106,273.20	\$ 35,153.56	\$ 12,628.21	3
Craig Ranch	\$ 98,203.17	\$ 98,203.17	\$ 66,770.36	\$ 10,413.08	\$ 21,019.73	6
East Houston	\$ 67,394.01	\$ 67,394.01	\$ 57,561.35	\$ 6,787.66	\$ 3,045.00	4
Innova / Southcross	\$ 86,245.35	\$ 86,245.35	\$ 57,406.52	\$ 25,838.83	\$ 3,000.00	1
Landmark	\$ 10,891.12	\$ 10,891.12	\$ 7,553.58	\$ 418.75	\$ 2,918.79	1
Mid-Cities	\$ 253,217.92	\$ 253,217.92	\$ 196,562.77	\$ 32,284.82	\$ 24,370.33	8
Plano	\$ 307,511.90	\$ 307,511.90	\$ 204,243.20	\$ 56,187.08	\$ 47,081.62	12
Empire HealthChoice Assurance, Inc. d/b/a Empire Blue Cross Blue Shield and as Blue Cross Blue Shield of New York						
	\$ 243,225.83	\$ 190,219.26	\$ 144,138.70	\$ 41,789.86	\$ 4,290.70	3
R&C	\$ 203,871.42	\$ 150,864.85	\$ 104,784.29	\$ 41,789.86	\$ 4,290.70	2
Landmark	\$ 203,871.42	\$ 150,864.85	\$ 104,784.29	\$ 41,789.86	\$ 4,290.70	2
U&C	\$ 39,354.41	\$ 39,354.41	\$ 39,354.41	\$ -	\$ -	1
Plano	\$ 39,354.41	\$ 39,354.41	\$ 39,354.41	\$ -	\$ -	1
Group Hospitalization and Medical Services, Inc. d/b/a CareFirst Blue Cross Blue Shield						
	\$ 20,300.85	\$ 20,300.85	\$ 18,261.86	\$ 1,429.96	\$ 609.03	1
U&C	\$ 20,300.85	\$ 20,300.85	\$ 18,261.86	\$ 1,429.96	\$ 609.03	1
East Houston	\$ 20,300.85	\$ 20,300.85	\$ 18,261.86	\$ 1,429.96	\$ 609.03	1
Healthnow New York Inc. d/b/a Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Western New York, Inc.						
	\$ 542,508.68	\$ 514,027.46	\$ 445,468.27	\$ 44,931.84	\$ 23,627.35	15

R&C	\$ 34,412.89	\$ 17,894.70	\$ 14,750.84	\$ 3,143.86	\$ -	2
Innova / Southcross	\$ 10,739.19	\$ 5,584.38	\$ 4,282.35	\$ 1,302.03	\$ -	1
Mid-Cities	\$ 23,673.70	\$ 12,310.32	\$ 10,468.49	\$ 1,841.83	\$ -	1
U&C	\$ 508,095.79	\$ 496,132.76	\$ 430,717.43	\$ 41,787.98	\$ 23,627.35	13
Craig Ranch	\$ 88,549.24	\$ 88,549.24	\$ 64,235.94	\$ 17,122.47	\$ 7,190.83	4
Innova / Southcross	\$ 43,051.22	\$ 43,051.22	\$ 31,791.58	\$ 4,954.76	\$ 6,304.88	1
Landmark	\$ 89,788.16	\$ 89,788.16	\$ 82,218.11	\$ 4,192.18	\$ 3,377.87	3
Mid-Cities	\$ 17,090.05	\$ 5,127.02	\$ 3,667.68	\$ -	\$ 1,459.34	1
Plano	\$ 269,617.12	\$ 269,617.12	\$ 248,804.12	\$ 15,518.57	\$ 5,294.43	4
Highmark BCBSD, Inc. d/b/a Highmark Blue Cross Blue Shield Delaware						
	\$ 4,012.00	\$ 2,246.72	\$ 1,952.84	\$ 35.10	\$ 258.78	1
R&C	\$ 4,012.00	\$ 2,246.72	\$ 1,952.84	\$ 35.10	\$ 258.78	1
East Houston	\$ 4,012.00	\$ 2,246.72	\$ 1,952.84	\$ 35.10	\$ 258.78	1
Highmark, Inc. d/b/a Highmark Blue Cross Blue Shield d/b/a Highmark Blue Shield						
	\$ 1,219,391.56	\$ 963,193.24	\$ 775,226.07	\$ 119,530.27	\$ 68,436.90	38
R&C	\$ 582,268.91	\$ 326,070.59	\$ 249,944.21	\$ 58,865.94	\$ 17,260.44	15
Beaumont	\$ 65,675.60	\$ 36,778.34	\$ 29,721.47	\$ 3,573.71	\$ 3,483.16	4
Craig Ranch	\$ 38,442.34	\$ 21,527.71	\$ 17,234.40	\$ 2,371.19	\$ 1,922.12	1
East Houston	\$ 31,650.49	\$ 17,724.27	\$ 13,214.91	\$ 2,858.64	\$ 1,650.72	3
Innova / Southcross	\$ 176,254.30	\$ 98,702.41	\$ 88,140.16	\$ 8,262.25	\$ 2,300.00	1
Mid-Cities	\$ 155,087.85	\$ 86,849.20	\$ 52,491.82	\$ 27,762.21	\$ 6,595.17	3
Plano	\$ 115,158.33	\$ 64,488.66	\$ 49,141.45	\$ 14,037.94	\$ 1,309.27	3
U&C	\$ 637,122.65	\$ 637,122.65	\$ 525,281.86	\$ 60,664.33	\$ 51,176.46	23
Beaumont	\$ 301,357.98	\$ 301,357.98	\$ 259,980.69	\$ 19,038.67	\$ 22,338.63	9
Craig Ranch	\$ 67,927.89	\$ 67,927.89	\$ 55,818.30	\$ 5,572.75	\$ 6,536.84	3
East Houston	\$ 23,946.43	\$ 23,946.43	\$ 21,726.28	\$ 951.13	\$ 1,269.02	2
Innova / Southcross	\$ 73,773.28	\$ 73,773.28	\$ 60,517.63	\$ 10,121.28	\$ 3,134.37	3
Landmark	\$ 25,738.23	\$ 25,738.23	\$ 15,851.71	\$ 8,856.99	\$ 1,029.53	1
Mid-Cities	\$ 144,378.84	\$ 144,378.84	\$ 111,387.25	\$ 16,123.51	\$ 16,868.08	5
Horizon Blue Cross and Blue Shield of New Jersey also known as Blue Cross Blue Shield of New Jersey						
	\$ 1,039,713.84	\$ 794,491.01	\$ 570,337.56	\$ 187,573.68	\$ 36,579.76	29
R&C	\$ 557,324.62	\$ 312,101.79	\$ 213,700.48	\$ 77,813.72	\$ 20,587.59	20
Craig Ranch	\$ 55,276.40	\$ 30,954.78	\$ 22,479.56	\$ 5,932.65	\$ 2,542.57	2

East Houston	\$ 11,406.60	\$ 6,387.70	\$ 4,904.92	\$ 739.67	\$ 743.11	1
Innova / Southcross	\$ 16,046.23	\$ 8,985.89	\$ 8,985.89	\$ -	\$ -	1
Landmark	\$ 139,954.47	\$ 78,374.50	\$ 57,082.32	\$ 16,528.92	\$ 4,763.26	3
Mid-Cities	\$ 190,804.26	\$ 106,850.39	\$ 88,259.55	\$ 16,258.22	\$ 2,332.62	8
Plano	\$ 143,836.66	\$ 80,548.53	\$ 31,988.24	\$ 38,354.26	\$ 10,206.03	5
U&C	\$ 482,389.22	\$ 482,389.22	\$ 356,637.09	\$ 109,759.96	\$ 15,992.17	9
Craig Ranch	\$ 343,429.45	\$ 343,429.45	\$ 247,896.08	\$ 87,705.12	\$ 7,828.25	5
Innova / Southcross	\$ 15,878.26	\$ 15,878.26	\$ 15,878.26	\$ -	\$ -	1
Mid-Cities	\$ 123,081.51	\$ 123,081.51	\$ 92,862.75	\$ 22,054.84	\$ 8,163.92	3
Independence Health Group, Inc., including its subsidiaries Independence Blue Cross, Independence Administrators, and QCC Insurance Company						
	\$ 420,652.89	\$ 313,252.53	\$ 217,788.93	\$ 77,280.12	\$ 18,183.48	6
R&C	\$ 244,091.72	\$ 136,691.36	\$ 84,921.00	\$ 51,627.24	\$ 143.12	1
Innova / Southcross	\$ 244,091.72	\$ 136,691.36	\$ 84,921.00	\$ 51,627.24	\$ 143.12	1
U&C	\$ 176,561.17	\$ 176,561.17	\$ 132,867.93	\$ 25,652.88	\$ 18,040.36	5
Craig Ranch	\$ 23,421.44	\$ 23,421.44	\$ 20,955.30	\$ -	\$ 2,466.14	1
Mid-Cities	\$ 17,915.89	\$ 17,915.89	\$ 16,548.17	\$ 607.41	\$ 760.31	1
Plano	\$ 135,223.84	\$ 135,223.84	\$ 95,364.46	\$ 25,045.47	\$ 14,813.91	3
Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company d/b/a Blue Cross Blue Shield of Louisiana						
	\$ 2,125,381.89	\$ 1,546,523.95	\$ 1,393,314.12	\$ 116,551.21	\$ 36,658.62	29
R&C	\$ 1,315,586.23	\$ 736,728.29	\$ 643,379.13	\$ 76,914.33	\$ 16,434.83	16
Beaumont	\$ 158,306.77	\$ 88,651.79	\$ 77,874.49	\$ 4,287.71	\$ 6,489.59	4
Craig Ranch	\$ 38,395.95	\$ 21,501.73	\$ 17,316.03	\$ 1,150.08	\$ 3,035.62	1
East Houston	\$ 59,660.88	\$ 33,410.09	\$ 19,465.87	\$ 12,751.01	\$ 1,193.22	2
Innova / Southcross	\$ 750,961.24	\$ 420,538.29	\$ 386,242.12	\$ 32,286.80	\$ 2,009.37	3
Mid-Cities	\$ 16,559.83	\$ 9,273.50	\$ 8,563.39	\$ 710.11	\$ -	1
Plano	\$ 291,701.56	\$ 163,352.87	\$ 133,917.22	\$ 25,728.62	\$ 3,707.03	5
U&C	\$ 809,795.66	\$ 809,795.66	\$ 749,934.99	\$ 39,636.88	\$ 20,223.79	13
Beaumont	\$ 193,569.47	\$ 193,569.47	\$ 176,740.93	\$ 10,508.17	\$ 6,320.37	5
Craig Ranch	\$ 14,445.74	\$ 14,445.74	\$ 13,219.40	\$ 735.84	\$ 490.50	1
East Houston	\$ 95,244.27	\$ 95,244.27	\$ 85,596.03	\$ 4,592.47	\$ 5,055.77	6
Landmark	\$ 506,536.18	\$ 506,536.18	\$ 474,378.62	\$ 23,800.40	\$ 8,357.16	1

Noridian Mutual Insurance Company d/b/a Blue Cross Blue Shield of North Dakota						
	\$ 41,374.19	\$ 23,169.55	\$ 14,141.72	\$ 9,027.83	\$ -	2
R&C	\$ 41,374.19	\$ 23,169.55	\$ 14,141.72	\$ 9,027.83	\$ -	2
Plano	\$ 41,374.19	\$ 23,169.55	\$ 14,141.72	\$ 9,027.83	\$ -	2
Premera Blue Cross and Premera Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Alaska						
	\$ 696,423.01	\$ 466,451.28	\$ 298,627.23	\$ 101,450.18	\$ 66,373.87	12
R&C	\$ 28,554.24	\$ 12,426.76	\$ 9,709.50	\$ 1,374.94	\$ 1,342.32	2
Craig Ranch	\$ 14,848.03	\$ 8,314.90	\$ 6,972.58	\$ -	\$ 1,342.32	1
Mid-Cities	\$ 13,706.21	\$ 4,111.86	\$ 2,736.92	\$ 1,374.94	\$ -	1
U&C	\$ 667,868.77	\$ 454,024.52	\$ 288,917.73	\$ 100,075.24	\$ 65,031.55	10
Craig Ranch	\$ 86,073.70	\$ 86,073.70	\$ 74,292.85	\$ 6,276.15	\$ 5,504.70	3
Innova / Southcross	\$ 158,132.57	\$ 158,132.57	\$ 80,809.75	\$ 46,393.71	\$ 30,929.11	1
Landmark	\$ 212,105.52	\$ 63,631.66	\$ 51,258.19	\$ 8,901.58	\$ 3,471.89	1
Mid-Cities	\$ 93,386.27	\$ 28,015.88	\$ 4,537.33	\$ 18,419.90	\$ 5,058.65	2
Plano	\$ 118,170.71	\$ 118,170.71	\$ 78,019.61	\$ 20,083.90	\$ 20,067.20	3
Regence BlueCross BlueShield of Utah						
	\$ 45,506.47	\$ 45,506.47	\$ 37,175.23	\$ 7,790.44	\$ 540.80	2
U&C	\$ 45,506.47	\$ 45,506.47	\$ 37,175.23	\$ 7,790.44	\$ 540.80	2
Landmark	\$ 45,506.47	\$ 45,506.47	\$ 37,175.23	\$ 7,790.44	\$ 540.80	2
RightCHOICE Managed Care, Inc. d/b/a Anthem Blue Cross and Blue Shield Missouri d/b/a Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Missouri						
	\$ 203,455.42	\$ 193,730.22	\$ 160,735.81	\$ 19,137.65	\$ 13,856.77	4
R&C	\$ 21,141.73	\$ 11,416.53	\$ 5,717.93	\$ 2,226.87	\$ 3,471.73	1
Beaumont	\$ 21,141.73	\$ 11,416.53	\$ 5,717.93	\$ 2,226.87	\$ 3,471.73	1
U&C	\$ 182,313.69	\$ 182,313.69	\$ 155,017.87	\$ 16,910.78	\$ 10,385.04	3
Beaumont	\$ 156,550.63	\$ 156,550.63	\$ 136,299.22	\$ 12,700.31	\$ 7,551.10	2
East Houston	\$ 25,763.06	\$ 25,763.06	\$ 18,718.65	\$ 4,210.47	\$ 2,833.94	1

Rocky Mountain Hospital and Medical Service, Inc. d/b/a Anthem Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Colorado						
	\$ 2,934,582.12	\$ 1,936,669.42	\$ 1,606,929.48	\$ 232,318.87	\$ 97,421.08	27
R&C	\$ 2,635,432.27	\$ 1,637,519.57	\$ 1,367,368.07	\$ 199,734.35	\$ 70,417.16	18
Craig Ranch	\$ 79,820.08	\$ 48,812.24	\$ 33,663.10	\$ 12,029.91	\$ 3,119.23	3
East Houston	\$ 39,020.21	\$ 25,525.65	\$ 23,389.94	\$ 1,767.23	\$ 368.48	2
Innova / Southcross	\$ 610,658.33	\$ 341,968.66	\$ 246,248.32	\$ 65,187.43	\$ 30,532.92	1
Landmark	\$ 1,580,784.93	\$ 1,034,646.20	\$ 942,838.74	\$ 69,324.72	\$ 22,482.74	7
Mid-Cities	\$ 304,162.15	\$ 174,814.35	\$ 113,704.20	\$ 51,425.06	\$ 9,685.09	4
Plano	\$ 20,986.57	\$ 11,752.48	\$ 7,523.77	\$ -	\$ 4,228.71	1
U&C	\$ 299,149.85	\$ 299,149.85	\$ 239,561.41	\$ 32,584.52	\$ 27,003.92	9
Beaumont	\$ 40,011.27	\$ 40,011.27	\$ 33,183.04	\$ 1,914.16	\$ 4,914.07	1
Craig Ranch	\$ 87,585.85	\$ 87,585.85	\$ 62,430.58	\$ 9,313.00	\$ 15,842.27	6
East Houston	\$ 29,074.07	\$ 29,074.07	\$ 22,419.48	\$ 3,392.76	\$ 3,261.83	1
Innova / Southcross	\$ 142,478.66	\$ 142,478.66	\$ 121,528.31	\$ 17,964.60	\$ 2,985.75	1
Wellmark, Inc. d/b/a Wellmark Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Iowa d/b/a Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Iowa						
	\$ 24,389.27	\$ 24,389.27	\$ 17,412.19	\$ 6,489.29	\$ 487.79	1
U&C	\$ 24,389.27	\$ 24,389.27	\$ 17,412.19	\$ 6,489.29	\$ 487.79	1
East Houston	\$ 24,389.27	\$ 24,389.27	\$ 17,412.19	\$ 6,489.29	\$ 487.79	1
Grand Total	\$48,570,872.07	\$39,596,451.97	\$31,371,566.65	\$6,155,331.95	\$ 2,066,272.53	777

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served on all counsel of record on May 4, 2018, through the Court's CM/ECF system. I further certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been served by email on counsel known to represent Defendants who have not yet appeared in this lawsuit. Defendants who do not have identified counsel have been served by Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested to either their registered agent or their principal place of business.

<p>Blaire B. Johnson Kate Easterling Thomas F.A. Hetherington EDISON MCDOWELL & HETHERINGTON LLP 1001 Fannin Street, Suite 2700 Houston, Texas 77002 blaire.johnson@emhllp.com kate.easterling@emhllp.com tom.hetherington@emhllp.com</p>	<p>Counsel for Blue Cross Blue Shield of California; Blue Cross of California; Anthem Blue Cross Life and Health Insurance Company; Rocky Mountain Hospital and Medical Service, Inc.; Anthem Health Plans, Inc.; Anthem Insurance Companies, Inc.; Blue Cross Blue Shield of Georgia, Inc.; Blue Cross Blue Shield of Indiana; Anthem Health Plans of Kentucky, Inc.; RightCHOICE Managed Care, Inc.; Anthem Blue Cross Blue Shield of Nevada; Anthem Health Plans of New Hampshire, Inc.; Empire HealthChoice, Inc.; Blue Cross Blue Shield of New York; Anthem Blue Cross of Ohio; Blue Cross Blue Shield of Ohio; Community Insurance Company; Anthem Health Plans of Virginia, Inc.; Anthem Blue Cross Blue Shield of Virginia; Blue Cross Blue Shield Anthem National Account</p>
<p>Jonathan M. Herman Charles W. "Chuck" Hill HERMAN LAW FIRM 1601 Elm Street, Suite 2002 Dallas, Texas 75201 jherman@herman-lawfirm.com chill@herman-lawfirm.com</p>	<p>Counsel for Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Alabama</p>
<p>Jennifer Gallagher 1901 Market Street, 43rd Floor Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103 jennifer.gallagher@ibx.com</p>	<p>Counsel for Independence Blue Cross and QCC Insurance Company</p>

<p>John B. Shely Courtney B. Glaser ANDREWS KURTH KENYON LLP 600 Travis, Suite 4200 Houston, Texas 77002 jshely@andrewskurth.com courtneyglaser@andrewskurth.com</p>	<p>Counsel for BlueCross BlueShield of Tennessee</p>
<p>Brian Keith Norman Kenneth J. Lambert SHAMOUN & NORMAN LLP 1800 Valley View Lane, Suite 200 Farmers Branch, Texas 75234 bkn@snlegal.com klambert@snlegal.com</p>	<p>Counsel for CareFirst of Maryland, Inc. and Group Hospitalization and Medical Services, Inc.</p>
<p>Henry B. Gonzalez III Gonzalez Chiscano Angulo & Kasson, P.C. 9601 McAllister Freeway, Suite 401 San Antonio, Texas 78216 hbg@gcaklaw.com (210) 569-8500 – tel (210) 569-8490 – fax</p> <p>Kimberly A. Klinsport FOLEY & LARDNER LLP 555 South Flower Street, Suite 3500 Los Angeles, California 90071 kklinsport@foley.com</p> <p>Michael A. Naranjo FOLEY & LARDNER LLP 555 California St., Suite 1700 San Francisco, California 94104 mnaranjo@foley.com</p>	<p>Counsel for Blue Cross of Idaho Health Service, Inc.; Blue Cross of Idaho Care Plus, Inc.; Blue Cross Blue Shield of Kansas, Inc.; Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Kansas City; Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Nebraska; Noridian Mutual Insurance Company; and Capital BlueCross</p>

<p>Michael C. Drew Tyler J. Rench Covert J. Geary JONES WALKER LLP 201 St. Charles Avenue, Suite 5100 New Orleans, Louisiana 70170 mdrew@joneswalker.com trench@joneswalker.com cgeary@joneswalker.com</p>	<p>Counsel for Arkansas Blue Cross and Blue Shield; BlueAdvantage Administrators of Arkansas; Highmark BCBSD, Inc.; Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Florida, Inc. d/b/a Florida Blue; Blue Cross Blue Shield of Iowa; Wellmark, Inc.; Louisiana Health Service & Indemnity Company; Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Massachusetts, Inc.; BCBSM, Inc. d/b/a Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Minnesota; Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Mississippi, a Mutual Insurance Company; Blue Cross Blue Shield of New Jersey; Horizon Blue Cross and Blue Shield of New Jersey; Blue Cross and Blue Shield of North Carolina; Highmark Health; Independence Health Group, Inc.; Blue Cross & Blue Shield of Rhode Island; Blue Cross and Blue Shield of South Carolina; Premiera Blue Cross; Highmark West Virginia, Inc.; Blue Shield of California Life & Health Insurance Company; Regence BlueShield of Idaho, Inc.; Regence BlueCross BlueShield of Oregon; Regence BlueCross BlueShield of Utah; and Regence BlueShield</p>
<p>Juan C. Garcia JOHNSON GARCIA LLP 7324 Southwest Fwy., Ste. 545 Houston, Texas 77074 juan@johnsongarcialaw.com</p> <p>Rebecca D'Arcy O'Reilly Bridget M. Hathaway BODMAN PLC 6th Floor at Ford Field 1901 St. Antoine Street Detroit, Michigan 48226 roreilly@bodmanlaw.com bhathaway@bodmanlaw.com</p>	<p>Counsel for Blue Cross Blue Shield of Michigan</p>
<p>Lifetime Healthcare, Inc. d/b/a Excellus BlueCross BlueShield 165 Court Street Rochester, New York 14647</p>	

CT Corporation System 301 S. Bedford St., Suite 1, Madison, Wisconsin 53703	Registered agent for Blue Cross Blue Shield of Wisconsin
---	---

/s/ Holly H. Barnes

Holly H. Barnes